



















*Donated by*  
**SRI S. C. ANDY, M.A.**  
*Maharajkumar of Coimbatore*  
1985

LIFE AND WORKS  
OF THE FIRST  
MARQUIS OF HALIFAX  
VOL. I.









*George Savile, first Marquess of Halifax,  
after the engraving by Walpole*





THE LIFE AND LETTERS  
OF  
SIR GEORGE SAVILE, BART.

FIRST MARQUIS OF HALIFAX &c.

● WITH A NEW EDITION OF HIS WORKS  
NOW FOR THE FIRST TIME COLLECTED AND REVISED

BY  
H. C. FOXCROFT

‘Turning to scorn, with lips divine,  
The falsehood of extremes’

IN TWO VOLUMES - VOL. I

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON  
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY ●

1898



# PREFACE

‘J’ayme les Historiens, ou fort simples, ou excellens: Les simples . . . qui n’y apportent que . . . la diligence de ramasser tout ce qui vient à leur notice . . . nous laissent le jugement entier, pour la cognoissance de la verité.’ -- MONTAIGNE.

‘Circumstances must come in, and are to be made a part of the matter of which we are to judge; positive decisions are always dangerous, more especially in politics.’ -- HALIFAX (‘A Rough Draught’).

IN an article on the works of Lord Halifax which appeared in the ‘English Historical Review’ for October 1896—and which constituted, in fact, a brief epitome of the following pages—attention was called by their author to the comparative neglect which has overshadowed the reputation of the brilliant writer and statesman to whose life and works they are devoted; and readers were reminded that authorities so varied and so distinguished as Hume and Ranke, as Ralph, Mackintosh and Macaulay, have described Lord Halifax in the language of superlative. Von Ranke, a by no means friendly critic, pronounces him one of the finest pamphleteers that have ever lived.<sup>1</sup> Mackintosh, whose estimate of Savile’s political action is seldom favourable, accords to him the attribute of a ‘brilliant genius;’<sup>2</sup> regards his ‘Letter to a Dissenter’ as ‘the most perfect model, perhaps, of a political tract,’<sup>3</sup> and observes that ‘the fragments of his writing which remain, show such poignant and easy wit, such lively sense, so much insight into character, and so delicate an observation of manners, as could

<sup>1</sup> *Englische Geschichte*, v. 148, edit. Berlin, 1859 68.

<sup>2</sup> *History of English Revolution*, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 174.

hardly have been surpassed by any of his contemporaries at Versailles.' <sup>1</sup> Lord Macaulay—whom we should have supposed incapacitated, by the prejudice of party and by the limitations of an intellect robust rather than subtle, from due appreciation of his merits—entertained for him, as is well known, a progressive admiration, which verged upon enthusiasm. To his championship Lord Halifax owes what little popular recognition he has attained; while, despite serious errors of conception and of detail, the brilliant portraits enshrined in the pages of the 'History' <sup>2</sup>—and even, to an inferior extent, the earlier and less adequate estimate of the 'Essay on Sir William Temple' <sup>3</sup>—display an imaginative insight rarely evinced by the great Whig historian. He declares Halifax, in point of genius, the first statesman of his age; asserts for his tracts their true place among the classics of English literature; and dilates on the extraordinary sagacity which, distinguishing Lord Halifax 'from all other English statesmen,' enabled him almost invariably, 'through a long public life, and through frequent and violent revolutions of public feeling,' to take 'that view of the great questions of his time which history has finally adopted.'

The article then demonstrated, in detail, the need for a 'Life and Works' of the statesman so suggestively eulogised. An error in this part of the essay <sup>4</sup> (kindly pointed out by Mr. Seccombe) calls for revision; brief appreciative notices of Lord Halifax, with short extracts from his pamphlets, occur in Craik's 'English Prose Selections' <sup>5</sup> and in Dr. Garnett's 'Age of Dryden.' <sup>6</sup> Mention should also have been made of Mr. Saintsbury's eulogistic references, in the 'Pocket Library of English Literature,' <sup>7</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> *History of English Revolution*, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> See especially in chapter ii. vol. i. p. 252, edit. 1858, and chapter xxi. vol. vii. p. 171.

<sup>3</sup> *Essays*, iii. 81-85, edit. 1848.

<sup>4</sup> 'His name occurs in no history of English literature, etc.' Mr. Seccombe also mentions an article by Mr. A. C. Ewald (Temple Bar, liii. 211). It is unimportant.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. iii. p. 209 (by Principal A. W. Ward).

<sup>6</sup> Pages 251-254.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. iv. pp. x, xi, xviii, and 1 (published by Percival & Co., 1892).

includes the 'Letter to a Dissenter;' while two of the Halifax tracts have been since republished, by Mr. Pollard, in the 'Pamphlet Library' of Mr. Waugh.

Shortly after the appearance of the above article the writer had the honour of seeing in proof the admirable notice of Lord Halifax contributed by Mr. Seccombe to the 'Dictionary of National Biography.' As stated by Mr. Seccombe, the manuscript of the present work was subsequently placed in his hands for the correction of his proofs. On the other hand, the present author is indebted to Mr. Seccombe's article for several very valuable references. Of these, by far the most important is the citation of an article by Mr. Elliot in 'Macmillan's Magazine,' vol. xxxvi. p. 452, which with information in the present writer's possession led to the identification of the manuscript designated throughout this work as the 'Devonshire House Notebook;' but material assistance has also been derived from Mr. Seccombe's allusions to Chester's 'Westminster Abbey Registers,' to the 'Peerage' by G. E. C., to the 'Genealogist' (vol. x. n.s.), to Dart's 'Westmonasterium,' to Sir E. Maunde Thompson's edition of the 'Hatton-Finch Correspondence,' to the Dangeau 'Journal,' and to the Ailesbury 'Memoirs.'

The author is further indebted to the courtesy of Professor Maitland, for the correction of a legal statement on pp. 4 and 5, vol. i.; to Mrs. Salmon, for references to Foster's 'Yorkshire Pedigrees'<sup>1</sup> and Musgrave's 'Obituaries';<sup>2</sup> to the Rev. J. S. Moore, for extracts from the Dagenham Registers;<sup>3</sup> and to the Rev. J. B. Medley for five valuable notes.<sup>4</sup>

Materials previously unpublished have been obtained from the Record Office; the Registry of Wills at Somerset House; the Manuscript Departments of the British Museum and Bodleian Libraries;<sup>5</sup> and from collections

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, chapters i. and ii. and Pedigree.

<sup>2</sup> See *infra*, vol. ii. p. 20, note 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> See *infra*, vol. ii. p. 291, note 2; p. 351, note 1; p. 413, note 2; p. 429, note 1; p. 528, note 1.

<sup>5</sup> In the latter case by kind permission of the authorities.



in the hands of private owners, who have been good enough to permit the transcription of manuscripts in their possession.

The history of the Savile archives is unfortunately obscure. On the death of the second (and last) Marquis, in 1700, Rufford (the principal seat of the family) passed to a younger branch. We presume that papers immediately relating to the final generations of the extinct line were removed to Halifax House, the town residence of the family, which seems to have descended to the co-heiresses of the second Marquis. In 17½ the house changed hands, and we find Lord Nottingham, maternal grandfather of the young ladies, writing to one of them (Lady Dorothy Savile) respecting the removal of family papers. 'You may afterwards,' he adds, 'upon perusal of y<sup>m</sup> judge what are fitt to be kept *and w<sup>t</sup> to be burnt.*'<sup>1</sup>

This last expression is ominous, and lends colour to the tradition which looms—a tantalising spectre—before the vision of the disappointed biographer. It appears tolerably certain, from the vague and disjointed notices upon which we are compelled to rely, that the first Marquis left behind him, among other unpublished papers, two copies of a manuscript described as his 'Journal' or 'Memoirs.' It has been stated in a note to Malone's 'Dryden,' on the authority of Lord Orford,<sup>2</sup> that Lord Nottingham *burnt one copy of the so-called 'Journal,' and that the second was destroyed by Lady Dorothy Savile herself* (who married the last Earl of Burlington), at the instigation of Alexander Pope, who regarded them as too critical of the Roman Catholic religion.

<sup>1</sup> Savile and Finch correspondence, British Museum Add. MSS. 28,569 f. 152: March 1, 17½: ' . . . when ye writings and family pictures and such things as are yours or you desire to have are remov'd to a room w<sup>h</sup> we must hire for the custody of them, I think it will be best to sell the rest. . . ' March 8, 17½: ' . . . As for those boxes and holes which you desire to search for papers, if you will trust me (if I am able) or L<sup>d</sup> Finch, he shall take care to search every ye least hole or corner and to bring away every scrip w<sup>h</sup>out looking into y<sup>m</sup> y<sup>t</sup> you may afterwards upon perusal of y<sup>m</sup> judge what are fitt to be kept and w<sup>t</sup> to be burnt ' (f. 154).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. ii. p. 209, note 1.

Despite this act of Vandalism, admirers of Halifax owe much to the memory of Lady Burlington.\* A woman of talent and literary taste, we must probably ascribe to her initiative the publication in 1742 of Algernon Sidney's correspondence with Mr. Henry Savile;<sup>1</sup> and of the 'Character of Charles II.' and 'Political, Moral, and Miscellaneous Thoughts and Reflections,' written by her illustrious grandfather, which were published in March 1750<sup>2</sup> from originals in her possession.

Lady Burlington died September 21, 1758.<sup>3</sup> She left an only surviving daughter and heiress, Charlotte, married March 28, 1748, to William Lord Hartington, afterwards fourth Duke of Devonshire.<sup>4</sup> We should suppose therefore that the Halifax papers must have passed into the possession of the Cavendish family.

Permission was very courteously accorded for the investigation and transcription of the Halifax manuscripts still at Devonshire House. A large portion of the official correspondence of Lord Halifax, described in a manuscript catalogue yet extant, seems to have disappeared. We do not gather, however, that these documents were of historical value. Others among the more interesting items of the collection have been long since published.<sup>5</sup> Of the remaining papers, by far the most valuable are the petition drawn up by Lord Halifax in 1688 for the seven imprisoned bishops; a number of very important memoranda, on loose sheets, in the hand of Lord Halifax (principally notes for speeches in Parliament during the years 1689-95); and the so-called 'Halifax Notebook.'

Meanwhile, curious to relate—and we are unable to offer any explanation of the circumstance—a proportion,

\* The originals were recently discovered at Devonshire House; they no doubt passed into the possession of the first Marquis of Halifax on the death of his brother Henry, to whom the letters are addressed.

<sup>2</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine*, xx. 144.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* xxviii. 452. Her husband had predeceased her in 1753. (See *ibid.* xxii. 590.)

<sup>4</sup> Burke.

<sup>5</sup> The Sidney letters (1742); letters of Lady Russell and Lady Sunderland (1819); the *Savile Correspondence* (edited by Mr. Cooper for the Camden Society, 1858, from a copy letter book).

almost equally large, of the Halifax manuscripts (*including letters from Lady Burlington to her daughter*\*) has found its way to the Spencer archives.<sup>1</sup> Special thanks are due for the liberality that has permitted a thorough inspection of these papers, which are admirably arranged. The mass of correspondence included in the collection has furnished much material, but the two most important items are : (a) a journal of conversations between William III. and Lord Halifax during the first year of the monarch's reign, evidently compiled by the Marquis about March 1690 from his original memoranda ; and (b) a very interesting manuscript character of Lord Halifax, entitled 'Saviliana.' To both of these manuscripts further reference is made below.

The Longleat collection<sup>2</sup> contains several letters from Lord Halifax, two of especial interest. These, with various other valuable specimens of contemporary correspondence, and an early manuscript version of the 'Character of a Trimmer,' were most kindly placed at the disposal of the present writer.

Acknowledgments are also due for the courtesy which has contributed complete transcripts of letters in the Welbeck and Netherby collections, previously but imperfectly reported by the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Two questions relative to the papers examined require a more detailed explanation.

I. As regards the identity of the so-called Diaries, Journals, and Memoirs of Lord Halifax, it appears certain that the Marquis left notices of contemporary events in three (or perhaps four) different forms :—

(a) Rough jottings and memoranda on loose sheets, of which several are extant at Devonshire House. (Two clerical transcripts of the 'Journals' at Spencer House, which are there preserved with the Halifax manuscripts, were, as is distinctly stated, copied from similar memoranda.)

<sup>1</sup> The collection is briefly catalogued in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ii., Appendix.

<sup>2</sup> Catalogued in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iii. and iv.

(b) Journals, in chronological order, arranged from the former. (An existing example is the Journal at Spencer House.)

- (c) Notebooks, in which notabilia from the preceding are arranged under subject headings, in index order. (Of this we have an instance in the Notebook now at Devonshire House—of which many entries are drawn from the Spencer House Journal. The former curious little volume is evidently identical with the ‘Diary’ of Lord Halifax, said to have been temporarily entrusted in 1781 to Robertson the historian for the purposes of an historical project eventually abandoned;<sup>1</sup> with the ‘Halifax MS.’ or ‘MSS.’ believed to have been employed by Fox in his ‘History of James II.,’ but never quoted by him, though cited freely by Sir James Mackintosh and Mr. Wallace;<sup>2</sup> with the ‘Diary’ understood to have been in the possession of the sixth Duke of Devonshire, but to have been missing at his death;<sup>3</sup> with the ‘New Manuscript of George Savile, first Marquis of Halifax,’ discovered during the year 1877 in the possession of Mrs. Trotter, granddaughter of the first Lord Dunfermline, and described at length by Mr. Elliot in ‘Macmillan’s Magazine’ for October 1877. [That editor points out the curious fact that the Notebook contains obvious quotations from the Keresby ‘Memoirs,’ which must therefore have been seen by Lord Halifax in manuscript.] The Notebook, we are informed, will be eventually published entire; in the meantime permission has been very kindly given to make use of extracts.)

(d) It is, of course, impossible to state whether the so-called ‘Memoirs’ destroyed in the eighteenth century

<sup>1</sup> Tyers, *Political Conferences*, p. 147, quoted in Mr. Christie’s article on Lord Halifax, *Saturday Review*, February 22, 1873.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the English Revolution*, pp. 9 (note), 10 (note), 55, 84 (notes d, c), 200 (note b), 279 (note b), 380 (note b), 381 (note c), 396 (note a), 452 (note c), 474 (note b), 483 (note a), 497 (note f), 556 (note c). Continuation of Mackintosh’s *History of England*, in Lardner’s *Encyclopædia*, vol. vii. pp. 255, 256 (notes); vol. viii. pp. 66, 98, 104, 112, 127, 163, 171, 181, 244, 295 (notes).

<sup>3</sup> Cooper, *Savile Correspondence*, p. xxiii (he speaks of ‘volumes’); and Mr. Christie, article on Sir William Coventry, *Saturday Review*, October 11, 1873 (quoting the seventh Duke of Devonshire, whom he had consulted).

belonged to either of these classes, or whether in the lost manuscripts Lord Halifax had thrown his materials into a literary form comparable to the historical portrait of Charles II. which he has left us.<sup>1</sup>

II. The second point which demands our peculiar attention relates to the authorship of the manuscript 'Saviliana.' From internal evidence we gather that it was intended as an introduction to a proposed edition of the tracts (presumably, the 'Miscellanies' of 1700), and was eventually omitted for some reason unexplained. The author, to judge by the tone of the composition, would appear to have been—(1) a divine, (2) preferably the domestic chaplain of Lord Halifax. (3) He had known the Marquis long and intimately; (4) defends him warmly from the charge of impiety; (5) sympathises to some extent with his Latitudinarian standpoint; and (6) refers to him in language which verges, to say the least, on the obsequious and the fulsome.

Two persons, so far as we have ascertained, are described as chaplains to Lord Halifax. Concerning Edward Wilson, we only know that he was keenly interested in current politics;<sup>2</sup> but our information with regard to *William Mompesson* is of far greater import. In the year 1664, having apparently graduated from Peterhouse, Cambridge, Mompesson was presented by Sir George Savile (afterwards created Lord Halifax) to the living of Eyam in Derbyshire.<sup>3</sup> A year later, at the date of the Great Plague, the infection was brought to Eyam from London in bales of merchandise. The devoted energy of Mompesson immortalised his name, and he showed a liberality too rare at that epoch in accepting the assistance of a predecessor who had been ousted on Bartholomew's Day, 1662, for Nonconformity. On September 1, upon the death of his wife and in expectation of his own decease,

<sup>1</sup> 'The Marquis . . . left *Memoirs*. . . . He kept a *journal* every day of all the conversations which he had with Charles II. [and others]. Of these *Memoirs* two . . . copies [etc.]' (Malone).

<sup>2</sup> See *infra*, p. 480, note 4; p. 508, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, art. on William Mompesson, by the Rev. H. E. D. Blakiston.

Mompesson wrote to Sir George Savile, who at the time, be it remarked, was credited with atheistical opinions.<sup>1</sup> The letter<sup>2</sup> is pathetic, but perhaps deserves the epithet of 'stilted,' which it has received. 'Sir' (it avers), 'this paper is to bid you a hearty farewell for ever, and to bring you my humble thanks for all your noble favours. . . . I have as much love as honour for you, and I will bend my feeble knees to the God of Heaven, that you' (and yours) 'may be blest with external and eternal happiness. . . . Dear Sir, let your dying Chaplain recommend the truth to you and your family, that no happiness nor solid comfort can be found in this vale of tears like living a pious life; and pray ever retain this rule, Never to do anything upon which you dare not first ask the blessing of God upon the success thereof. Sir, I have made bold in my will with your name for an executor. . . . Your favourable aspect will, I know, be a great comfort to my distressed orphans. I am not desirous that they may be great, but good. . . . I desire, Sir, that you will be pleased to make choice of an humble pious man to succeed me in my parsonage; and could I see your face before my departure from hence, I would inform you which way I think he may live comfortably amongst his people. . . . Dear Sir, I beg your prayers, and desire you to procure the prayers of all about you. . . . I am, Dear Sir, your most obliged, most affectionate, and grateful servant.' Mr. Mompesson, however, survived the ravages of the Plague, and in the year 1669 was presented by Savile to the living of Eakring, which parish is situated close to Rufford, the patron's seat; but it is said that the horror of contagion, even at that distance of time, rendered the people averse to receive him, and he lived some time in a hut within the precincts of Rufford Park. At Eakring he remained till his death in 1709, fourteen years after the death of his patron, having refused the Deanery of Lincoln in favour of a friend.<sup>3</sup> The respect which his courage and his virtues

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 31, note 5.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in Seward's *Anecdotes*, ii. 120, edit. 1798.

<sup>3</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxi. part 1, p. 302.

cannot have failed to inspire seems to have been qualified in the case of Lord Halifax by a certain impatience of his foibles, notably of the adulation whereof Halifax himself was the object.<sup>1</sup> These details give some probability to our hypothesis that Mompesson was the author of the manuscript in question, the whole of which has been incorporated in the following pages.<sup>2</sup>

A few letters of Lord Halifax (known to exist) are unavoidably omitted; those mentioned in the first report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (p. 56) have not been traced; another, catalogued in the eighth report (p. 554<sup>b</sup>), could not be recovered. Further letters or information would be very gratefully received.

A portrait of the Marquis (by Lely) is said to exist in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire;<sup>3</sup> others, of which one is described as by Kneller, are mentioned among the pictures still at Rufford.<sup>4</sup> The frontispiece to vol. i. of the present work reproduces in miniature the print by Houbraken, published in Birch's 'Lives' (p. 127); this represents a Rufford portrait, but may have been taken from an engraving,<sup>5</sup> of which several are in the British Museum. The engraving prefixed to vol. ii. is taken from

<sup>1</sup> 'They told me a story of one Mr Mompesson, who had been my L<sup>d</sup> Halifax his Chaplaine, and happened to preach some where and my L<sup>d</sup> was there, he prayed for him as his L<sup>d</sup> and Patron, and my L<sup>d</sup> was very angry, asked him if he could not be content to play the foole but he must let the world know whose foole he was' (letter dated April 16 1693, Tanner MSS. xxv. 33, in the Bodleian).

<sup>2</sup> Any reader desirous of reconstructing the manuscript should read the extracts in the following order: vol. ii. p. 196, note 1 (then follows, with the sub-title, 'Some Account of the Following Papers and of their Noble Author') 'The three first bearing particular relation to the Time in which they were writ, it is necessary to know their Date, the better to understand them'); vol. ii. pp. 275-277; *ibid.* pp. 361, 426; *ibid.* pp. 196-199, vol. i. pp. 176, 115; vol. ii. p. 464, note 1; *ibid.* p. 388; vol. i. p. 31, note 4; vol. ii. pp. 199, 200

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Seecombe, article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>4</sup> *Beauties of England and Wales*, vol. xii. part 2, p. 388, edit. 1813; and article in the *Pall Mall Magazine*, April 1898, by Lord Savile.

<sup>5</sup> It is said to be from a picture in the possession of Sir George Savile, Bart. (i.e. at Rufford).

<sup>6</sup> Lord Orford, *Works*, iv. 125, edit. 1798: 'Houbraken . . . living in Holland, ignorant of our history, uninquisitive of what was transmitted to him, engraved whatever was sent.'

the monumental alto-relievo medallion which (supported by substantial cherubs) adorns the tomb of Lord Halifax in Westminster Abbey. Lord Macaulay considered it more lifelike than any other representation of the Marquis with which he was acquainted.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the plan of the present work, it is best defined in the language of Montaigne quoted above. The object has been less to obtrude the opinion of the compiler than to give the reader every facility for forming an independent judgment. All the evidence available is cited, where possible, *in the words* of the original authority; and this attempt affords the apology for a multiplicity—it is feared, a redundancy—of footnotes. Faults of a yet more serious kind will be apparent to all discerning readers; nor has the writer any wish to deprecate the censure which they deserve. Some indulgence, however, may be accorded to one compelled to retrace on occasion, in very pedestrian fashion, the ground rendered classic by Macaulay; while a lenient construction is requested for any such errors, verbal or literal, as may be subsequently detected in transcripts from private collections, which, owing to the great mass of papers examined, had often to be taken with some rapidity.

<sup>1</sup> *History*, vol. iv. p. 143, edit. 1858.

Revised by

FRANK

Morgan

M.A.





# CONTENTS

## THE FIRST VOLUME

GEORGE SAVILE, FIRST MARQUIS OF HALIFAX . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
<i>After the engraving by Houbraken.</i>	

PAGE

PREFACE . . . . .	v
-------------------	---

## PART I. LIFE AND LETTERS

### CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE SAVILE FAMILY BIRTH OF GEORGE SAVILE, AFTERWARDS MARQUIS OF HALIFAX . . . . .	1
APPENDIX: THE SAVILE-WENTWORTH LITIGATION . . . . .	15

### CHAPTER II

YOUTH OF SIR GEORGE SAVILE . . . . .	17
APPENDIX: NOTICES RELATING TO THE SAVILE ESTATES, 1614-60 . . . . .	27

### CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL LIFE—RELATIONS WITH LORD CHANCELLOR CLARENDON . . . . .	28
APPENDIX: THE SAVILE ESTATES, 1660 . . . . .	57

### CHAPTER IV

THE ASCENDENCY OF BUCKINGHAM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 'CABAL,' 1667-72 EMBASSY OF 1672 . . . . .	59
APPENDIX: THE MIDDLEBURGH MANIFESTO . . . . .	102

### CHAPTER V

IN OPPOSITION, 1673-79—RELATIONS WITH LORD SHAFTESBURY AND SIR WILLIAM COVENTRY . . . . .	103
VOL. I. . . . .	a

CHAPTER VI

	PAGE
THE PRIVY COUNCIL OF 1679 . . . . .	141
APPENDIX: LETTER FROM ALGERNON SIDNEY TO LORD HALIFAX . . . . .	204

CHAPTER VII

IN RETREAT, FEB.-SEPT. 1680 . . . . .	205
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII

THE 'EXCLUSION' CONTEST OF 1680 81 . . . . .	233
APPENDIX: ESSENTIAL CLAUSES OF THE EXCLUSION BILL	293

CHAPTER IX

IN THE GOVERNMENT, 1681 85	
PART I.—PRELIMINARY: AT RUFFORD, MARCH MAY 1681 .	294
PART II.—'FIRST MINISTER,' MAY 1681—MARCH 1681 <sup>1</sup> <sub>2</sub> .	298
PART III.—ASCENDENCY OF THE DUKE OF YORK, MARCH 1682 AUG. 1684 . . . . .	357
PART IV. THE REVULSION OF 1684 . . . . .	420
APPENDICES: I. THE ACCUSATION OF SUBORNATION . .	436
II. COMMISSION TO MANAGE THE ECCLESIASTICAL PATRONAGE OF THE CROWN .	436
III. THE MARQUIS OF HALIFAX TO VISCOUNT WEYMOUTH . . . . .	437

CHAPTER X

IN DISGRACE, 1685-88	
PART I.—PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL, FEB. OCT. 1685 . . .	438
PART II.—OUT OF OFFICE, OCT. 1685 OCT. 1688 . . .	451
APPENDIX: THE MARQUIS OF HALIFAX TO VISCOUNT WEYMOUTH . . . . .	510

CORRIGENDA

- Page 193, note 6, for Musgrave *read* Mulgrave.  
 Page 215, note 3, for Sir Thomas Thynne the elder *read* Sir Henry Frederick Thynne.  
 Page 488, for As is testified by Baxter. . . whence it proceeded, *read* As is testified by Dr. Calamy in his Life of Baxter; and for the Application *read* this Application.  
*Ibid.* note 2, for Reliquiæ *read* Calamy's Baxter, edition 1713, vol. i. pp. 376, 377.

## • CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA. •

### A.—*Authorities.*

- Vol. I. p. vi, line 30, *after* made *add* of Mr. Gosse's 'History of Eighteenth Century Literature' [1889], pp. 89, 90, and his 'Short History of Modern English Literature' [1898], pp. 183-4; of Mr. Saintsbury's 'Specimens' [1885], pp. 99-103, and
- p. vii, note 4, *for* p. 291, note 2, *read* p. 291, note 3.
- Vol. II. p. 314, note 2, *add* Carte's 'Ormonde,' iv. 303-8.
- p. 105, *after* his Lordship's innocence, *add* reference to Devonshire House Notebook
- p. 392, note *a*, *for* first *read* second.

### B.—*Connection of Lord Halifax with Shrewsbury School.*

- Vol. I. p. 13, line 25, *add* On February 15, 1642 3. George and William Savile, 'equitis auctati filii eboracensis,' were entered at Shrewsbury School, then under the charge of Thomas Chaloner, a staunch Royalist, the school buildings being at the moment occupied by the Royal troops.
- p. 18, line 24, *for* in default conclude that, *read* it is not clear whether
- p. 18, line 26, *for* and thus, *read* but in any case this
- p. 18, line 28, *after* career, *add* As regards his immediate fortunes, the young Saviles can scarcely have remained at Shrewsbury after Chaloner was superseded by the Puritans, February 22, 1642. [Information kindly contributed by E. Tudor Owen, Esq.; Rev. G. Fisher; T. E. Pickering, Esq.]

### C.—*Disposition of the Savile Estates.*

- Vol. I. p. 5, line 9, *for* with Rufford, *read* with the reversion of Rufford and Brierley.
- Vol. I. p. 191, *for* the estates . . . Scarborough Lumley's, *read* the estates being divided between his sisters and co-heirs, through whom respectively they passed to the Foljambes of Osberton, and the Scarborough Lumleys. Foster's 'Yorkshire Pedigrees'; White's Worksop,' pp. 161-180.]

### D.—*Works attributed to the Marquis of Halifax.*

- Vol. I. p. 536, *add* IVa. 'The Character of the Protestants of Ireland . . . MDCLXXXIX. A sensible and impartial investigation into the pecuniary position of the Irish Protestant refugees. Though anonymous, it is ascribed to the Marquis of Halifax by Halkett and Laing ('Dictionary of Pseudonyms,' p. 788) on the authority of a contemporary MS. note, ('supposed to be written by [H.],') but the pamphlet bears no trace of his style.

IVb. 'A Letter from a Nobleman in London' [H.]. This anonymous pamphlet, of which a copy is in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, is attributed to Lord Halifax by Halkett and Laing (p. 1353). It is in fact an able and rather virulent production, the work presumably of a Scotch Jacobite, and betrays not the slightest resemblance to the style and contemporary sentiments of the Marquis. Certain allusions, however, in the 'Letter' with which the tract commences, together with the significant fact that it is dated February 8, 1689 [90], on which day Lord Halifax

• resigned the Privy Seal, suggest a deliberate attempt at imposture.

[P.T.O.]

VOL. II. p. 511, *add* IX. 'The Equivalent Explain'd.' This pamphlet, of which there is a copy in the Advocates' Library, is ascribed to Lord Halifax by Halkett and Laing (p. 788). In reality it was written during the reign of Queen Anne, by some anonymous Scotch supporter of the then impending Union.

*E.--Pedigree.*

*Re* Lady Mary Talbot, *dele* February 1694 [and on p. 5, line 24, Vol. I. *substitute for these words* before the end of the 16th century].

*For* Thomas Savile, died 1546, *read* 1646.

*Re* Arabella, sister of Sir George Savile, eighth Bart., *delete* the present, and *substitute* -

Arabella = John Thornhagh, of Tenton and Osberton, co. Notts  
Savile, sister | x

Two daughters <i>d. unm</i>	Mary, - daughter and heir (1st wife)	Francis Ferrand Foljambe, of Aldwark, co. York
-----------------------------------	---	--

John Savile Folja <i>d. v.p.</i>	Elizabeth Willoughby	Four son <i>d. s.p.</i>	Two daughters
-------------------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------

Harriett, daughter of Sir W. Milner Bart.	George Savile Foljambe	Lady Selina Charlotte (Dow Viscountess Milton), daughter and co-heir of 3rd Lord Liverpool (2nd wife)	One son	Two daughters
	Francis Savile Foljambe, of Osberton	Geor <sup>d</sup> George Savile Foljamb 1st Baron Hawkesbury	1	1

PART I.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF GEORGE SAVILE

FIRST MARQUIS OF HALIFAX



# LIFE AND LETTERS

## OF THE FIRST

# MARQUIS OF HALIFAX

### CHAPTER I

#### HISTORY OF THE SAVILE FAMILY—BIRTH OF GEORGE SAVILE, AFTERWARDS MARQUIS OF HALIFAX

ANCESTRAL history—always, where available, an interesting and valuable introduction to biography proper—demands even unusual attention in the case of George Savile, first Marquis of Halifax: a man in whom the pride of race was strong to a fault, and whose inherited prepossessions so often modified, after a somewhat fantastic fashion, the conclusions of a sceptical intellect. Nor is the story of the Savile family in itself devoid of curious and even romantic episodes, upon which we shall now briefly touch, omitting the dryer genealogical items.

In spite of the accident which led the first Marquis of Halifax, the head of the house, to select Rufford in Nottinghamshire for his residence, the Saviles are essentially a Yorkshire family; one of the most illustrious, if not the most illustrious in the West Riding of the county of York.<sup>1</sup> Whitaker, the great Yorkshire antiquary, describes the race as ‘distinguished almost above every other in the public concerns of the county of York, as well as by the spirit and genius of its principals in several of the later descents;’<sup>2</sup> and Hunter is even more emphatic.<sup>3</sup> In noticing the transference of the Lupset estates during the

<sup>1</sup> Cooper, *Introduction to the Savile Correspondence*, *Loidis and Elnote*, pp. 310–326.

<sup>2</sup> *Antiquarian Notices of Lupset*, p. 11, 1848.



fifteenth century to the hands of 'a family of the first distinction in the county,' he adds that 'those who are acquainted with the topographical or genealogical history of the 'parts of Yorkshire westward from Wakefield along the left bank of the Calder' will at once understand, 'that the family alluded to can be no other than the Saviles.' He tells us how, from the tenth to the eighteenth century, 'the Savilian family' (which in his day, as in our own, could boast a single surviving branch),<sup>1</sup> 'existed in many distinct lines, to every one of which belonged old halls, surrounded with estates of greater or less extent. Many of these halls,' he continues, 'stood near the line of the Calder, from Bradley beyond Elland to near the union of that river with the Aire.' He reminds us that in a family 'of great and varied ability' some were eminent as scholars, some as lawyers, and some were 'of much energy and aptitude for business, so that they filled eminent stations in their own county, and were engaged influentially in the general affairs of the realm.' In conclusion he refers to the fact that the administration of the Manor of Wakefield and the Honour of Pontefract, both appurtenances of the Crown, became almost hereditary in the Savile family.

The origin of this distinguished name is obscure. Some have claimed<sup>2</sup> for the family a connection with the noble Roman house of the Savelli, now extinct—a plea which appears to have been investigated<sup>3</sup> by Lord Halifax, who applied to the Savelli family for information.

Others rightly reject this improbable derivation and fix their attention on a 'Sheville' whose name appears on the list of Battle Abbey. The great Yorkshire antiquaries,<sup>4</sup> however, usually trace this celebrated patronymic to the Borders of Anjou, where there are two towers of the name, and suppose that the Saviles came over with Geoffrey Plantagenet.<sup>5</sup> When the thirteenth century opens, we find the family settled in that south-west corner of the West Riding within which its various branches, with very

<sup>1</sup> The Mexboroughs.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to Savile's *Reports*.

<sup>3</sup> Henry Savile the younger (eldest son of Lord Halifax) to his father, Rome, January 19, 1678, *Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 15. M. du Moulin (tutor to Henry Savile) to Lord Halifax, Rome, October 16, 1677, and January 12, 1678, *Deronsshire House MSS.*

<sup>4</sup> Hopkinson, Hunter, Watson.

<sup>5</sup> Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, ii. 261, mentions a Richard de Savile, quoted by Brompton as present at the coronation of Geoffrey's grandson, Cœur de Lion.

## HISTORY OF THE SAVILE FAMILY

few exceptions, subsequently flourished, and which—including as it does Sheffield, Leeds, Bradford, Halifax, and Wakefield—is now regarded as one of the chief industrial centres of England; for in 1225 Golcar, close to Halifax, belonged to Henry de Savile<sup>1</sup> in right, it is said, of his wife.

The importance of the family was rapidly enhanced by judicious alliances. Thus in the reign of Edward I. a John de Savile married one of the three co-heiresses of Rishworth, and obtained with her a third part of the Rishworth estates, situated close to Eland, in the neighbourhood of Halifax;<sup>2</sup> while his eldest son and successor, another Sir John, purchased about 1350<sup>3</sup> the hand of Tabell, only surviving representative of the Elands of Eland. The manors of Eland, Tankersley, Fulridge, Hinchfield and Ratchdale, with a second portion of the Rishworth estates, passed, in consequence of this marriage, into the possession of the Savile family.<sup>4</sup> But the rich inheritance brought with it a tragical stigma.

A catastrophe of mingled guilt and horror had closed the annals of the Eland line. The brutal murder<sup>5</sup> of Beaumont of Whitley, on the victim's own hearth-stone, at the hands of Sir John Eland, Sheriff of Yorkshire, had been as brutally avenged on the part of the Beaumonts by the successive assassinations of Sir John, his son, and his grandson. The tragedy appears to have made an unusual impression on the popular mind; a local drama extant as late as the times of Charles II., with a ballad which may be studied in the pages of Watson, preserved the sinister story. Nor can we wonder at the remonstrances with which Henry Savile, brother of Lord Halifax, subsequently greeted the announcement that the head of the house had adopted Eland as his second title.<sup>6</sup>

A younger son of the Savile-Eland marriage secured the heiress of Thornhill,<sup>7</sup> an estate which lies between Halifax and Wakefield;<sup>8</sup> and to this branch the Savile-

<sup>1</sup> Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, ii. 260 (other early notices will be found in the same work); and Foster's *Yorkshire Pedigrees*, 1874.

<sup>2</sup> Watson, *Halifax*, pp. 86-113.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 169, from *Comput. seneschal. honoris de Pontefract*, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Foster gives a different account of these acquisitions.

<sup>5</sup> Watson and Hunter.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Cooper explains the allusion otherwise, but, I think, erroneously (*Savile Correspondence*, p. iii).

<sup>7</sup> Whitaker, *Lofds and Elmete*; and pedigree in the *Radcliffe Correspondence*. See also Foster.

<sup>8</sup> The second son of this marriage married the heiress of Copley of Copley, from which union the Saviles of Copley, Methley, Bradley, Hullenedge, Newhall in Eland, Haigh, Watergate, Blathroyd, Wath, not to mention the existing family of Mexborough, all traced their descent. So the pedigree

Island estates passed when, in the second generation, the elder line came to an end. Thornhill thus became the principal seat of the family, and so remained for over two hundred years; and in the beautiful Savile chantry attached to the parish church their tombs may yet be seen.

The history of the house from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries need not detain us. Its representatives ranked among the great men of the county, and their names appear regularly in the lists of sheriffs and knights of the shire. In the sixteenth century it could boast of a connection with the reigning house of Tudor<sup>1</sup> and of an intimacy, more practically valuable to a North Country family, with the powerful race of Talbot, whose principal representatives as lords of Hallamshire lived like petty kings among the sturdy cutlers of Sheffield.<sup>2</sup> But Sir Henry Savile, K.B.,<sup>3</sup> in whom the glories of the Savile name appeared to culminate, left as heir<sup>4</sup> a son, Edward, of weak intellect and under age, whose marriage, contracted some years earlier, had proved childless. Scarcely therefore had the unhappy youth attained his majority ere fierce disputes as to the fate of his lands, should he die without leaving issue, arose between his sister—Henry Savile of Luptet,<sup>5</sup> head of a branch which had separated from the parent stem about a hundred years previously—and a bastard half-brother, on whom the father had settled everything alienable, and whose descendants, under

in the *Radclyffe Correspondence*. Earlier pedigree, accepted by Foster, antedates the alliance by several generations. This branch produced two distinguished men, Sir John Savile of Bradley (1515-1606), a Baron of the Exchequer and author of Savile's *Reports*; and his brother, the celebrated scholar Sir Henry (1549-1622), Greek tutor to Queen Elizabeth, Warden of Merton, and founder of the Savilian professorships.

<sup>1</sup> Through Joan, an heiress of the ancient Yorkshire house of Paston of Woodnoth, whose mother was Joan, daughter and co-heiress of Edmund Duke of Somerset.

<sup>2</sup> Lady Joan Savile, above mentioned, remarried with Sir Richard Hastings, brother to the Lord Hastings executed under Richard III. and of the Countess of Shrewsbury. Hastings, in 1511, obtained the wardship of his stepson, but in some unexplained fashion the Shrewsbury family assumed an interest in the trust (Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, ii. 302; Hunter, *Luptet*; Taylor's *Wakefield*; Whitaker's *Lordis and Elmete*, p. 326).

<sup>3</sup> He has been described as one of the ablest and most influential men of his time. For his correspondence with the Talbots, see the *Devonshire MSS.* and catalogue of *Rufford MSS.* (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., Appendix, part 7, p. 120). For his correspondence with the Cecils, see catalogue of *Hatfield MSS.* (published by the *Hist. MSS. Com.*)

<sup>4</sup> The *inquisitio post mortem* includes among his estates 300 messuages, 300 tofts, 10 water mills, and 20,080 acres of land. Whitaker conjectures that the wastes amounted to an equivalent acreage. A great deal, however, he alienated in favour of a bastard son, as above (*Lordis and Elmete*, p. 312).

<sup>5</sup> Luptet is not far from Wakefield.

the successive titles of Savile and Sussex, long eclipsed the legitimate branch.<sup>1</sup> A settlement of the property on the Lupset branch was made, but ascribed by some to undue influence on the part of the Talbots, to whom the care of the young Edward's minority had been entrusted; nor were these impressions removed by the suspicious circumstances under which the marriage of the miserable young man was annulled in the ecclesiastical courts, while an infant daughter of the house of Talbot, with Rufford in Nottinghamshire as her dowry, was married to young Savile of Lupset. The unhappy lord of Thornhill seems to have survived until old age, a tool in the hands of his powerful connections, who assumed entire management of his affairs.<sup>2</sup> On his death in 1604, a year after the accession of James I., Sir George Savile of Lupset succeeded to the Eland-Thornhill estates and became head of the great Savile connection.

He maintained the most intimate relations with the Talbots, and supported that active part in local business which was a family tradition;<sup>3</sup> and when in 1611 James created the order of baronets of England,<sup>4</sup> Sir George Savile was one of the earliest upon whom the distinction was conferred, no doubt for the usual consideration. His first wife, Lady Mary Talbot, died February 1605, leaving an only son, born in 1583.<sup>5</sup> By a second marriage the baronet had several children, and we suspect a desire on his part to enrich these at the expense of his son and heir, with whom relations became evidently strained.<sup>7</sup> •

<sup>1</sup> The magnificent mansion built at Howley by the second of this line is described in Mackham's *Fairfax*, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> See for this story Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, ii. 302; *St. Pap. Dom. Eli. abell*, iv. 32, *ibid.* xii. 3; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 7, p. 119 (this seems to be incorrectly given); *St. Pap. Dom. Eli.* xxiv. 52; *Devonshire MSS.*; and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 7, pp. 120-122. The Record Office papers were discovered by Mr. Cooper, but his account is not very clear (*Savile Correspondence*, Introduction); he is certainly wrong in attributing to these transactions Henry Savile's repugnance for the title of Eland. Edward was of Thornhill rather than of Eland.

<sup>3</sup> He matriculated at St. John's College, Oxford, before 1566, and is believed to have been of Lancelot's Inn in 1568 (Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*, iv. 1318). For his correspondence, see *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 7; *Devonshire MSS.* He was knighted in Holland 1587; represented Boroughbridge 1586-87, and Yorkshire 1593 (*Alumni Oxonienses*, iv. 1318). He was sheriff 1611.

<sup>4</sup> The order of 'Baronets in England' preceded by some years, in date of institution, the order of 'Baronets of Scotland' (or Nova Scotia).

<sup>5</sup> See *Cal. St. Pap. Dom. James I.* for a warrant to antedate the patent (July 2, 1611).

<sup>6</sup> See letter from his father to Lord Shrewsbury, asking him to stand godfather, April 12, 1583 (*Devonshire MSS.*).

<sup>7</sup> See a letter in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 7, p. 123. Lupset was

1607 But this son, another Sir George, did not want for friends. Left a widower during the same month which had seen the death of his mother,<sup>1</sup> he had remarried September 14, 1607, with Ann, eldest daughter of his neighbour Sir William Wentworth of Wentworth Woodhouse, a man of ancient lineage and local importance. Her eldest brother, Thomas Wentworth, the 'Strafford' of history, at the time of her marriage a boy of thirteen, developed a passionate affection for his brother-in-law, which was soon put to the proof. During the month of August, 1614,<sup>2</sup> less than ten years after his marriage, and within the lifetime of his father, died Sir George Savile, of 'Soothhill, Knight,' leaving to the care of his brother-in-law and of George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>3</sup> (his former tutor at Oxford), his two little sons.<sup>4</sup> He could not have made a better choice. Wentworth had just succeeded, at the age of twenty-one, to an estate of 6,000*l.* a year and the charge of eleven brothers and sisters. He was distinguishing himself, moreover, in county business by his opposition to old Sir John Savile of the bastard Howley branch, known to history, though scarcely to fame, as the first Lord Savile. Yet, despite these weighty preoccupations, the young guardian accepted his new responsibilities with characteristic energy,<sup>5</sup> which was stimulated in this case by the strong affection he had entertained for his sister's husband. He erected in the Savile chapel at Thornhill a magnificent monument to the memory of the dead man,<sup>6</sup> received his sister and

settled upon John, eldest son of the second marriage, afterwards an active Parliamentarian. (See Markham's *Fairfax*, p. 68.) A series of letters from Sir John will be found in Bell's *Fairfax Correspondence*, i. 177-181. The Rufford estates eventually passed to his descendants, when in 1700 the elder line, and with it the peerage, became extinct.

<sup>1</sup> His first wife died, like his mother, in February, 1605 (*Savile Finch Correspondence*, British Museum, Add. MSS. 28,569, f. 160; *Radcliffe Correspondence*, Pedigree). A project for his remarriage in March 1605 (i.e. within a month of his wife's death) seems suggested in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 1, p. 56. For particulars concerning him, see *Alumni Oxonienses*.

<sup>2</sup> Cooper says he was buried at Thornhill, August 24, 1616; but *Savile-Finch Correspondence* and *Alumni Oxonienses* refer the event to August 24, 1614, and the petition mentioned in a subsequent note distinctly states that he died 'August, 12 Jacobi' that is, 1614.

<sup>3</sup> Forster's (Browning's ?) *Strafford*, p. 218, from Rushworth, i. 451. Even the reversion of this important wardship was coveted (*Loidis and Elmets*, i. 313; from *Harleian MSS.* 6,986).

<sup>4</sup> The birth of the elder is mentioned in *Radcliffe Correspondence*, February 1<sup>st</sup> 1610, p. 57.

<sup>5</sup> See a letter from Edward Talbot, brother of Lady Mary, to Sir Thomas, dated April, 1616 (*Strafford Correspondence*, i. 3).

<sup>6</sup> Whitaker, *Loidis and Elmets*, p. 323.

her sons into his establishment,<sup>1</sup> and was prodigal of his labours on their behalf. 'He spent,' says his confidant, Sir George Radcliffe, 'eight Years Time, beside his Pains and Money, in soliciting the Businesses and Suits of his Nephews, Sir George and Sir William Savile, going every Term to London, about that only, without missing one Term in thirty, as I verily believe: And all this merely in memory of the Kindness which had passed between him and his Brother in Law Sir G. Savile, then deceased.' This litigation, to which Sir Thomas and Sir George Savile the elder were parties, concerned, it would seem, the Eland-Thornhill estates, which, as Wentworth appears to have contended, had become legally vested, presumably by the terms of the Savile-Talbot settlement, in the younger Sir George.<sup>2</sup> At one stage of the contest the old baronet and his wife were actually committed to the Fleet for contempt of court, and proceedings seem only to have ceased with his death on November 12, 1622.<sup>3</sup> He was succeeded by his elder grandson; but this youth, Sir George, second baronet, having matriculated at University, May 5, 1626, died in college December 19 following.<sup>4</sup> The title and estates devolved on his brother William, destined to be the father of George, afterwards the first Marquis of Halifax, the subject of this memoir.

It is obvious that the Savile trust exercised important influence over the political career of Sir Thomas Wentworth. It probably exaggerated the jealousy between himself and Sir John Savile,<sup>5</sup> which first brought Wentworth into collision with Savile's patron, the omnipotent favourite, Buckingham; and to this feud, intensified as it was by the fears of the great man and the ambition of the Yorkshire baronet, the popular sympathies of Wentworth's earlier career may be ascribed. The contest culminated with the imprisonment of Wentworth about the date of his elder nephew's death,<sup>6</sup> and his disgrace

<sup>1</sup> List of his household in Hunter's *South Yorkshire*, ii. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Strafford Correspondence*, i. 3, ii. 436, and petition given in Appendix to this chapter.

<sup>3</sup> For further mention of him see *Loidis and Elmete*, p. 317; *Radcliffe Correspondence*, pp. 112, 114, 117; *Ashmolean*, 836, f. 565 (Bodleian).

<sup>4</sup> *Alumni Oxonienses*, which further says that he matriculated at the age of fifteen, and was buried at Thornhill, January 20. In this last item *Savile-Finch Correspondence* (l. 160) and Mr. Cooper agree; but the former authority gives his age as seventeen, and Whitaker declares that he was buried in the college chapel.

<sup>5</sup> For which, see the *Strafford Correspondence* and *Fairfax Correspondence* (Johnson), vol. i.

<sup>6</sup> See *Radcliffe Correspondence*, April 30, 1627, p. 140.

1628 involved that of his co-trustee, Archbishop Abbot, whose intercourse with Sir Thomas seems to have entirely depended on the Savile trust.<sup>1</sup> Ere long the Court, conscious of Wentworth's value, opened secret negotiations with the daring Yorkshireman, and during the summer of 1628 he became a Privy Councillor, receiving moreover a peerage, with the vast powers attaching to the Northern Presidency.<sup>2</sup>

Nor did the new statesman neglect his nephew's interests. A year later his influence secured for the young Sir William, a high-spirited boy of seventeen,<sup>3</sup> the hand of Anne, eldest daughter of Thomas, first Lord Coventry, Keeper of the Great Seal. The young couple were married at Thornhill, the bridegroom's seat, December 29, 1629; and the alliance, of which George, afterwards first Marquis of Halifax, was the first male issue, proved an eventful one for the fortunes of the house. The new Lady Savile was a woman of considerable character, devout, able, energetic, and endued with a courage which found, as we shall see, frequent scope in the troubled days of the Civil War. The Coventry connection, moreover, which possessed in an unusual proportion both ability and political interest,<sup>4</sup> was destined to exert no small influence over the character and career of her eldest son—a man, as he appeared in the sequel, peculiarly susceptible to the ties of kinship.

Henry, her fourth brother, will often meet us in diplomatic and ministerial capacities during the reign of Charles II. Thomas Thynne, eldest son of her sister, Joan, Lady Thynne,<sup>5</sup> became a valued friend and ally of

<sup>1</sup> Forster's (Browning's?) *Strafford*, p. 218; from Rushworth, i. 451.

<sup>2</sup> See a letter from Savile of Methley (*Strafford Correspondence*) expressing a wish to occupy the parliamentary seat thus vacated, 'until your Lordship's Nephew and my young Cousin Sir William be more capable thereof' (*Strafford Correspondence*, i. 48).

<sup>3</sup> He must have been born in 1612, as he matriculated at University, December 8, 1626, at the age of fourteen (*Alumni Oxonienses*, iv. 1319). He became a student of Gray's Inn two years later, and was thus about seventeen at the time of his marriage.

<sup>4</sup> *The Coventry Connection*. The Lord Keeper married twice. By his first wife he had Thomas, his successor; and a daughter, married to Sir John Hare, Bart., of Stow Bardolph, Norfolk. By his second wife, John, who settled on his wife's estate in Somerset, and became the father of Sir John Coventry, of 'Coventry Act' fame; Francis, Henry, William, Anne, Joan, Margaret, and Dorothy; the last a woman of saintly attributes, reputed authoress of a celebrated treatise on the *Whole Duty of Man*. She married Sir John Packington.

<sup>5</sup> Married to Sir H. F. Thynne, Bart., of Kempsford, younger son of Sir Henry Thynne of Longleat, to whose estates her son eventually succeeded.

his distinguished Savile cousin; while the marriage of a younger sister, Margaret, with the youthful Dorsetshire baronet, Anthony Ashley Cooper, better known to us as the first Lord Shaftesbury, formed an initial tie between George Savile and the statesman with whom during later life he was in a political sense so particularly connected. But a far stronger interest attaches to her youngest brother, the celebrated William Coventry—at the time of her marriage a child of three years old—the mentor in later years of his nephew George, whose literary reputation he was doomed in so innocent a manner to defraud. 1628-33

The first child of the Savile-Coventry marriage, a daughter,<sup>1</sup> was born on August 29, 1632. A year later, while Sir William was yet in his minority, died the Dowager Lady Savile; and as the twenty-first birthday of the young baronet approached, Lord Wentworth, newly promoted to the government of Ireland, felt it incumbent upon him to accompany his nephew's entrance upon life with a letter of sage admonition. Suggestive as are the counsels of this remarkable piece,<sup>2</sup> which presupposes in Sir William a disposition peculiarly impetuous and independent, with a strong sarcastic vein, the main interest for us lies in a few words added as an afterthought, 'Pray you present my Service to my Neice, and God give her long Comfort of the son, Charles Price tells me, God hath sent her.'

For the son and heir thus cursorily introduced, like so many matters of importance, in a postscript, is the subject of the following memoir; and there is a dramatic incongruity in the accident which presents to our notice the future 'Trimmer' through the medium of the most 'Thorough' among English statesmen. Nor is the connection devoid of a further significance; for diverse as were their principles and their fortunes, yet as regards the pride of birth and of intellect, as regards personal courage and self-reliance, neither yields to the other. The birth of the young heir had taken place six weeks earlier, November 11, 1633. He had been christened on the 28th by the name of George, which name, as we are aware, had been appropriated to the eldest son of the family during the three preceding generations.

The glimpses of the Savile household which the Strafford papers afford are not infrequent. We find George Wentworth, the Deputy's brother, visiting Sir William,

<sup>1</sup> Mary, who died young early in 1637.

<sup>2</sup> Dated Dublin, December 29, 1633 (*Strafford Correspondence*, i. 168).



1633 38 his 'Lady,' and 'my Sister Elizabeth,' at the young couple's lodgings, adjoining the Lord Keeper's house.<sup>1</sup>

King Charles I., like his father James, finds Sir William's hunting-seat at Rufford, by right of which the baronet held a perpetual keepership of the forest, 'very pleasant and commodious for hunting' in Sherwood;<sup>2</sup> and Wentworth himself, during a rare visit to England, would halt at his nephew's house on his way north. The Lord Keeper and the Deputy perceive in their common relation to the young couple a bond of interest. It is Coventry who breaks to Lord Wentworth<sup>3</sup> the tidings of a 'little Kinswoman's' death, Mary Savile, whose loss had been concealed from her mother till after the birth, at Durham House, of a 'fine Boy.' 'The lawyer breathes a devout hope that the suitor of a younger daughter 'may in Mind as in Constitution of Body resemble my Son Savile, whose Match your Lordship first moved and begun;' while the Deputy confesses that he loves the young man as a son, 'as much in Remembrance of his Father (a Person in Truth of as much Virtue and Nobleness as ever I knew) as of my Sister.'

Nor was this affection, strange to say, diminished by the daring and spirit which had already<sup>7</sup> brought the young man into collision with the Vice-President and Council of the North, the representatives of his formidable uncle.<sup>8</sup> To the remonstrances of the President the young baronet responded respectfully indeed, but with a spirit and freedom sufficiently remarkable under the circumstances.

The conciliatory tenor of Wentworth's own language is no less remarkable;<sup>9</sup> and even when, at the commencement of the Scotch troubles, the exasperated Vice-President complains<sup>10</sup> that 'if Sir William Savile may always

<sup>1</sup> March 3, 1633, i. 218. See also Garrard to Wentworth, June 20, 1631 (*Strafford Correspondence*, i. 267), and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iv. 292.

<sup>2</sup> Thoroton, *Antiquities of Nottinghamshire*, iii. 338. Wentworth to Calvert, *Strafford Correspondence*, August 14 and 31, 1624, i. 23 and 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Strafford Correspondence*, January 11, 1637, ii. 46.

<sup>4</sup> The Keeper's town house.

<sup>5</sup> Probably William, who died young.

<sup>6</sup> *Strafford Correspondence*, August 18, 1637, ii. 93; September 26, 1637, *ibid.* p. 108.

<sup>7</sup> Wentworth to Savile, September 26, 1637, quoted by Savile to Wentworth, 'Oct. ult. 1637' (*Strafford Correspondence*, ii. 127).

<sup>8</sup> Wentworth retained the title of President after his appointment to Ireland, and executed the functions of the former office by deputy.

<sup>9</sup> January 24, 1637, *Strafford Correspondence*, ii. 147.

<sup>10</sup> July 31, 1638, *Strafford Correspondence*, ii. 193. See also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 2, p. 204.

prevail in his accustomed Ways of Opposition. . . . both Lord President, Council, Deputy-Lieutenants and Justices of Peace may soon sit down and let him govern,' the Deputy's remonstrances<sup>1</sup> are couched in terms rather of sorrow than of anger. He inculcates indeed an absolute and unquestioning submission to authority, and hints significantly enough that the penalties of treason are soon incurred; but even this forcible objurcation ends with the warm avowal, 'I must in all Things prefer my Nephew Savile before all other Men or Subjects in the North of England.' His counsels, however, proved futile. A few months later<sup>2</sup> Laud himself describes the enmity between Savile and the Vice-President as the most salient feature of the dissensions which raged among the Yorkshire gentry;<sup>3</sup> while the Deputy felt constrained to warn 'his imperious nephew, 'If you must needs oppose, chuse some other than me to rush upon, that in all Probability shall prove over weighty to be removed by you . . . for let me tell you, I am so confidently set upon the Justice of my Master, and upon my own Truth, as under them and God I shall pass through all the Factions of Court, and Heat of my Ill-willers, without so much as sindging the least Threid of my Coat'—a prophecy strangely reversed three years later.

Events moved fast; by the end of 1639 the Scotch difficulty, once apparently composed, had again assumed threatening proportions; and even Wentworth saw that Parliament alone could replenish an Exchequer exhausted by eleven years of unparliamentary government. Before it could meet, however, the death of the Lord Keeper<sup>4</sup> deprived the Court of the one statesman who commanded popular confidence.<sup>5</sup> An able and excellent, though scarcely brilliant man, his character displays a caution and reserve which, inherited to some extent by his grandson George, tempered in him the Savile rashness and the overbearing temperament of the Wentworths.

<sup>1</sup> *Strafford Correspondence*, ii. 215.

<sup>2</sup> December 29, *Strafford Correspondence*, p. 261.

<sup>3</sup> See also *Correspondence*, ii. 246, 281, 284, 285, 308, 310.

<sup>4</sup> March 27, 1639, *Correspondence*, ii. 311. Savile's answer was respectful but not submissive. See correspondence between Wentworth and Mr. Greenwood in April and May, *Strafford Correspondence*, ii. 338. Savile was with his regiment at Berwick in May (*Strafford Correspondence*, ii. 339). There is rather an interesting letter to him from his 'affectionate loving father in law, Tho. Coventrye C.S.' dated Durham House, June 14, 1639, among the *Deronshire MSS.* It mentions the severe illness and present recovery 'of yo<sup>r</sup> little sonne John Savile,' evidently a mistake for *George*.

<sup>5</sup> January, 1640.

<sup>6</sup> Clarendon.

1640 When on April 13, 1640, the 'Short Parliament' met, William Savile represented the county which had so often returned his ancestors. He strongly maintained the popular cause; and his speech<sup>1</sup> against ship-money no doubt had its share in provoking the rash and fatal dissolution of a Parliament which had sat but three weeks.<sup>2</sup> Sir William received a prohibition forbidding him to quit London without leave from the Council; and openly regretted that an accidental moderation of language had saved him from sharing the fate of certain fellow-members, who expiated their boldness by imprisonment in the Fleet.<sup>3</sup>

The Scotch difficulty soon reached, for the third time, an acute stage; and though Strafford,<sup>4</sup> who was bitterly disappointed by the failure of the preceding session, strained every nerve to raise funds, the entire absence of pecuniary or moral support compelled a fresh resort to Parliament. Sir William again stood for the county, but was defeated after a contest;<sup>5</sup> and he was therefore absent both at the opening of the 'Long Parliament' on November 3, and also when, a week later, the impeachment was brought against Strafford. But early in the succeeding year he was returned for Old Sarum,<sup>6</sup> and he was therefore a member when his uncle's trial commenced, March 22. On May 10 the Bill of Attainder received the Royal Assent; on May 12 Strafford passed to execution. George Savile was between seven and eight years of age at the date of this tragedy, which must therefore have ranked among his earliest recollections, and chance has preserved the remorseless judgment which fifty years later he pronounced upon the conduct of Charles.<sup>7</sup>

Despite their former differences, it seems practically certain that Sir William Savile strongly espoused the cause of his uncle; and to this circumstance, probably assisted

<sup>1</sup> May 4 (Gardiner).

<sup>2</sup> May 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. St. Pap.* 1640, pp. 154, 156. See also *Cal. St. Pap. Dom.* 1640, p. 524; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iii. 298.

<sup>4</sup> He had received the earldom during the preceding January.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Fairfax and Henry Bellasis were the successful, Sir William Savile and Sir Richard Hutton the defeated candidates (*Cal. St. Pap. Dom.* 1640-41, p. 158, October 10, 1640). A letter concerning this election is among the *Devonshire MSS.*, dated October 12, 1640, at 'Sheffield.' The canvassing on either side seems to have been energetic.

<sup>6</sup> *Retuans of Members of Parliament*, i. 496 and note.

<sup>7</sup> See App. to chap. xiii., *Notes on Hackel's Life of Williams.*

<sup>8</sup> His interest in the fate of his uncle's confidant, Radcliffe, is proved by a letter in the *Devonshire MSS.* addressed to a servant, and dated London,

by episcopal sympathies, we may reasonably ascribe his 1642 early and enthusiastic adhesion to the Royal cause. A year later, April 7, 1642, he had left London, and was summoned in vain by special messenger to the seat he had vacated.<sup>1</sup> He probably retired to Rufford, his Nottinghamshire seat, where he was joined by his young brother-in-law, Ashley Cooper, a delicate, brilliant, precocious lad of twenty, excluded from Parliamentary life by a disputed return.<sup>2</sup> We find Sir William with the King at York in June.<sup>3</sup> A few weeks later he joined, with four members of the Upper House and nine of the House of Commons, all 'residing in Yorkshire,' as signatory of a petition to Parliament which was regarded as unprecedented, and was voted both insolent and deserving of punishment.<sup>4</sup> He was present at Nottingham for the raising of the Royal Standard, August 22.<sup>5</sup> A fortnight later he was expelled the House of Commons;<sup>6</sup> he was one of the earliest whose 'good estates' were offered as security for Royal loans,<sup>7</sup> and he signed the abortive suspension of Rodwell, September 29.<sup>8</sup>

During his absence his wife and children, including, of course, the young George, removed to Thornhill with the Ashley Coopers, until the disturbed state of the country compelled them to take refuge with friends first in Durham, then in Shropshire.<sup>9</sup> About the middle of 1643 Sir Anthony, who had hitherto maintained a strict neutrality, declared for Charles; but motives of public or private discontent soon impelled him to change sides. Early in 1644 he ostentatiously transferred his allegiance<sup>10</sup> and summoned his wife to London.

Sir William Savile meantime was gaining considerable distinction as a soldier.<sup>11</sup> When towards the end of

'last of November, 1644;' also by *Radcliffe Correspondence*, p. 239. In consequence of a petition which he had presented to the House he had been summarily committed to the Tower, receiving before his release a reprimand on his knees from the Speaker (May 18). The nature of this petition is never specified, but we may reasonably connect it with his uncle's affair (*See Commons' Journal*, May 18, 21; June 12, 28, 29.)

<sup>1</sup> *Commons' Journal*.

<sup>2</sup> Autobiography of Cooper, in Christie's *Shuttesbury*, vol. i., app. i. p. xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* v. 28; Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, i. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Bell's *Fairfax Correspondence*, i. 48.

<sup>5</sup> Cooper, as above.

<sup>6</sup> *Commons' Journal*, September 6, 1642; *Returns of Members of Parliament*, p. 496.

<sup>7</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 9, p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> Drake, *Eboracum*, p. 160.

<sup>9</sup> Cooper's autobiography, as above. The move to Shropshire took place in February, 1644. They there lived with Lady Thynne (p. xxviii).

<sup>10</sup> During 1642 he seems to have been in command of the Royalist force

1642-43 1642<sup>1</sup> (in pursuance of the scheme which aimed at concentrating the Royalist contingents of the North and South, together with the central body, of which Oxford was the headquarters, upon London, the stronghold of Parliamentary resistance) Lord Newcastle marched South into the West Riding, the daring spirit and local knowledge of Savile stood the Marquis in good stead. Sir William became master of Leeds and Wakefield, without opposition, and was only driven thence by the 'rider of the white horse,' Sir Thomas Fairfax himself,<sup>2</sup> who had thrown himself into Bradford and who was supported by the men of Halifax. But Newcastle<sup>3</sup> soon resumed his interrupted advance, and, having taken Sheffield, appointed Savile the governor.<sup>4</sup> His family apparently removed thither, but the services of Sir William were required elsewhere,<sup>5</sup> and he left the castle in charge of a deputy, Major Beaumont. His correspondence with this gentleman<sup>6</sup> paints at once the military ardour of Sir William and his anxiety for the safety of the place. The entire collapse of the Royalist plan of campaign, in July, 1643,

at 'Lord Savile's strong house at Howley,' Sir Thomas Fairfax found there '500 men, with Store of Arms and Ammunition.' Sir William Savile and Major Beaumont made their escape before the House was taken' (Oldmixon, ii. 209). It is difficult to reconcile this statement with allusions in *Camden Miscellany*, viii.; *Papers relating to . . . Lord Savile*, pp. 7-15.

<sup>1</sup> December, 1642. See *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 1, p. 69, letter from Langedale to Savile, November 9, 1642; Gardiner; and Markham's *Fairfax*, pp. 79-90. He quotes Lister's autobiography; Hodgson's memoir, *The Rider of the White Horse; God in the Mount*; Rushworth, v. 125.

<sup>2</sup> See Oldmixon, ii. 212-13; and Markham's *Fairfax*, pp. 86-90. He quotes *The Rider of the White Horse*; Hodgson's memoir; Fairfax's *Short Memoir*; May, iii. chap. iv. p. 197; and Vickers, p. 261. Savile had about 2,000 men; Fairfax, nine troops of horse and dragoons, 1,000 musketeers, and 3,000 clubmen. To the written summons of Fairfax Savile responded *en cavalier*; 'he never took notice of such frivolous tickets.' It is said that he was nearly drowned on his flight to Pontefract; but if the Beaumont mentioned as his companion be the same as the Major Beaumont to whom much of his correspondence was addressed, the account of that gentleman's death is erroneous.

<sup>3</sup> There is a curious note from Charles to Newcastle among the *Newcastle Correspondence* in the British Museum, on which we can throw no light ('The bearer . . . will tell you why I make a demon concerning Sir William Savill'), dated Matson, August 22, 1643 (*Harleian MSS.* 6,988, f. 154).

<sup>4</sup> By warrant dated May 9, 1643 (Hunter, *Hallamshire*, p. 136). See also warrants signed by his name, May 15, 18 (*ibid.* p. 137).

<sup>5</sup> He was at Pontefract, May 29.

<sup>6</sup> Printed in Hunter's *Hallamshire*, pp. 137-41. They range from May, 1643, to January, 1644, a few days previous to the writer's death. The originals are in the Bodleian. For the contributions levied by Savile, see the *Cal. St. Pap. Dom. Commonwealth* (Committee of Compounding), pp. 1232, 1350, 1384. For persons who had joined the Royalists under pressure from him, see *ibid.* pp. 1985, 2511.

increased his solicitude; by November 2 Savile warns Beaumont of a probable attack: 'if the castle chance to be besieged, keepe it to the uttermost, as you love him that is,' &c. A report that Sir William had lost the favour of Charles is contradicted ten days later under the hand of the Sovereign himself;<sup>1</sup> and the governorship of York, conferred on Savile a month subsequently,<sup>2</sup> was probably intended as an additional mark of approbation. He did not, however, long survive the appointment, since on January 25 Newcastle announced to Beaumont the death of his superior officer; and on February 15 Sir William Savile, who had not attained his thirty-second year, was laid among his forefathers in Thornhill church.<sup>3</sup>

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER I

### *The Savile-Wentworth Litigation*

FROM a curious undated petition presented to Parliament by (Sir) George Savile (Bart.) we gather the following details: Sir George, after the (second) marriage of his son, had devised to his said son for thirty-one years, 'if the petitioner and his said sonne should so long live, at a nominal rent, certain property, a portion of the Eland-Thornhill estate. This, on the death of his son, August, 12 Jacobi (1611), he had resumed. Sir Thomas Wentworth, uncle and guardian of the infant heir,

<sup>1</sup> Holovapp note, *Spencer MSS.*, dated Oxford, November 13, printed in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat. St. Jan. Dom.* 1641-43, p. 509 (newsletter of December 28, 1643).

<sup>3</sup> *Bad Life Correspondence*. Instances of Sir William's charity to the dispossessed clergy are given in *Harleian MSS.* 2,013 (f. 136b) and in *Loudis and Elmhurst*, p. 302. An elegiac anagram on Sir William's name will be found in *Loudis and Elmhurst*, p. 316. The source is not stated. Two lines run as follows:

And yet for us heaven's eye hath not espi'd

The life of Sir William Savile is epitomised by Mr. Cooper in the *Savile Correspondence*. It is dated July 18, 1642, with codicil of January 1, 1644, and was proved January 27, 1644. His landed estates appear to have been conveyed to trustees, John Coventry of Barton and Sir John Hare, by indenture dated November 20, 1631, for a term of twenty years (i.e. until his son's majority). His only specific legacy to George comprised his arms, both horse and foot, with the furniture thereto belonging. The 'faithful friend,' John Selden, to whom a special bequest is made, may be certainly identified with the great jurist. Though selected to assist in the prosecution of Strafford, he had voted against the attainer (Selden's *Table Talk*, Singer's edition, 1860, p. 19), and his mention in this place is another proof of the continued respect in which the learned Parliamentarian was held (*ibid.*, pp. 14, 15, 85, 86) by men of all parties.

hereupon suggested 'that the Petitioner's sonne died seised of an estate in Tayle,' extending apparently to the entire estate of Edward Savile, probably on the plea that it had been settled upon the heirs of the Savile-Talbot marriage. Proceedings in the Court of Wards against Sir George, his (second) wife, and another commenced November 1615. One decision appears to have been given in their favour, October 1616; but in November, at the instance of Wentworth, they were ordered to produce certain documents a second time, and upon refusal Sir George and his wife were committed, May 24, 1617,<sup>1</sup> to the Fleet. During their imprisonment, December 1617, so the petitioner asserts, Sir Thomas obtained a Commission, directed to his nominees, before whom and in his presence, January 2, 1617, a packed jury, after a perfunctory and surreptitious investigation, found that Sir George Savile the younger had died seised in fee of the resumed estate. (From a collection of *Parliamentary Petitions* in the Guildhall Library, f. 80, No. 52.)

<sup>1</sup> The reference to their imprisonment, in *Radclyffe Correspondence*, p. 114, in a letter dated June 14, 1616, suggests that that letter is misplaced by a year.

## CHAPTER II

## YOUTH OF SIR GEORGE SAVILE

1644-60

SIR WILLIAM left his young wife and her children – the 1644  
 eldest of whom, the youthful Sir George, was but ten years  
 of age—in a sufficiently precarious situation. The Royalist  
 cause rapidly declined, and the Marquis of Newcastle soon  
 found himself obliged to retreat upon York.<sup>1</sup> The army of  
 the Eastern Association on the one hand, and of the Scots  
 on the other, reinforced the Yorkshire Parliamentarians;  
 and though Rupert, by a gallant dash, relieved York, the  
 annihilation of his army on Marston Moor, outside the  
 city gates, compelled a surrender.<sup>2</sup> The Eastern Army  
 was thus enabled to retrace its steps; and on the way  
 Lord Manchester detached Major-General Crawford, with  
 orders to reduce Sheffield Castle, where Lady Savile and  
 her children were still located. Major Beaumont acted  
 as governor; but it is to the exhortations of Lady Savile  
 that the Parliamentarians<sup>3</sup> ascribe the defiant response  
 which their formal summons encountered.<sup>4</sup> It seems not  
 improbable that anxiety for the lady herself may have  
 suggested the governor's vacillation, since she was ex-  
 pecting the birth of a posthumous child.

The besiegers immediately raised two batteries and  
 opened fire upon the castle. A cannonade of twenty-four  
 hours proving ineffectual, more powerful artillery seems to  
 have been procured from General Fairfax, with the assist-  
 ance of which a breach was soon effected. The officer in  
 command now despatched the final summons preparatory

<sup>1</sup> 1644, April.<sup>2</sup> July 16.<sup>3</sup> *Cad. St. Pap. Dom. Commonwealth* (Committee for Advance of Money), p. 1018.<sup>4</sup> July 27.<sup>5</sup> Crawford had 1,200 foot, a regiment of horse, and three pieces of ordnance, the largest being a 'demi-culverin.' The garrison comprised a troop of horse and 200 foot. They had ten pieces of artillery, and the castle was defended by a wet moat 18 feet deep, 'a strong breastwork palisaded,' and a wall 6 feet thick (Vices, *Parliamentary Chronicle*, as quoted by Hunter, *Hallamshire*, p. 112).



1644 to the final assault ; this resulted in a parley ; and upon August 11 a treaty of surrender was concluded.

It would appear that Lady Savile, mindful no doubt of her husband's passionate solicitude for the fortress, had opposed the capitulation to the last ; and that, although the enemy had refused passes to the women whose services her condition required, the heroic lady had resolved to perish rather than yield to the enemy. But the soldiers, we are told, had begun to mutiny : ' not so much concerned for their own danger ' as for the lamentable situation ' of this noble lady.'<sup>1</sup> Her child was born on the very day after the belligerents had come to terms ; it was christened by the name of Talbot, and presumably did not long survive.<sup>2</sup>

The articles<sup>3</sup> of surrender seem to have been highly favourable. The garrison retired with all the honours of war, including free liberty to remove all property, and to retire unmolested. A special proviso stipulates that Lady Savile, her children, and household shall pass ' with coaches, horses, and waggons ' to Thornhill or elsewhere, accompanied by a sufficient guard befitting her quality ; and she has leave to defer the move ' until she or they be in a condition to remove themselves.'<sup>4</sup>

In default of specific evidence we may conclude that the child-baronet had shared with his family the horrors of the siege ; and this experience of civil war in its practical aspects was not perhaps without influence on his subsequent career.

Meanwhile Parliament had assumed an interest in the little Sir George, with which his friends could have well dispensed. Two months earlier an Ordinance bestowing on Lord Wharton the wardship of Sir William Savile's heir had been read in the Commons.<sup>5</sup> More serious matters, however, intervened ; and it was not till the army had inflicted upon Charles the terrible defeat of Naseby<sup>6</sup> that the Ordinance, having been re-introduced, passed in due form.<sup>7</sup> By this Ordinance the guardianship of the child devolved upon Lord Wharton, with the care of his education and a yearly allowance out of the profits of the estate. The custody of his lands meanwhile was

<sup>1</sup> *Vita Joannis Barwick*, pp. 67, 68 ; Eng. edit. pp. 112, 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Genealogist* (N.S.) x. 160.

<sup>3</sup> Printed in full by Hunter (*Hallamshire*).

<sup>4</sup> The castle remained a Parliamentary stronghold till 1649, when it was demolished by order of Parliament.

<sup>5</sup> *Commons' Journal*, June 11 and 12, 1641.

<sup>6</sup> June 1645.

<sup>7</sup> *Commons' Journal*, July 8 and 16, 1645 ; *Lords' Journal*, vii. 499, where it is given at length.

vested in trustees,<sup>1</sup> with instructions to pay 4,000*l.* out of the rents by instalments to Lord Wharton for the supplying of his lordship's 'pressing wants.'<sup>2</sup> It is more than doubtful, however, whether Wharton ever practically obtained the custody of the young baronet. Lady Savile was a woman of determination and resource, and an engagement under the sign-manual, executed by Charles, November 26, 1646, while in the Scots quarters at Newcastle 'to confirm to Lady Anne Savile, with proper legal formality, a grant already heretofore made to her of the wardship and marriage of her son Sir George Savile, Baronet,'<sup>3</sup> is evidence of her anxiety on the point.

• Strange to say, however, among the very considerable mass of papers we have examined, there is no single entry which throws light upon the personal history of Sir George Savile between the years 1644-54. The place of his abode, the character of his guardians, the circumstances of his education are alike unknown to us. It is practically certain that he never entered at either university. His acquaintance with foreign languages, his own subsequent preference of a foreign education for his sons, and the state of English society at the moment suggest a Continental breeding as the possible solution; but here we are left to conjecture. A Mr. Davidson is described as his tutor, concerning whom one is also at a loss.

With regard to Lady Savile our information is somewhat fuller. She is frequently mentioned with admiring respect in the Life of Dr. John Barwick,<sup>4</sup> afterwards Dean of St. Paul's; a bold and unwearied clerical intriguer devoted to the Royal interest, who may be described as an historical 'Dr. Rochecliffe.' He had been introduced to her by Thomas Holder, 'Governor to the Duke of York,' an active agent of the party. The interval between the ending of the 'first Civil War' in May, 1646 (which coincided with the surrender of Charles), and the outbreak of the 'second Civil War' in 1648, afforded peculiar scope for agitation. Holder was especially assiduous--'particularly,' to use his own words, 'in discharge of a great

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Lister, Knight; Brian Stapleton; and Richard Brainthwaite, of Ruffendale, in the county of Westmorland, esquires.

<sup>2</sup> 2,000*l.* (which Sir George in vain attempted to recover at the Restoration) was immediately advanced him. (*Commons' Journal*, v. 505; *Cal. Com. Adv. Mon.* p. 69.)

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vi. 472.

<sup>4</sup> *Vita Joannis Barwick* (by Peter Barwick, his brother). See index to that work.

<sup>5</sup> Letter appended to *Vita Joannis Barwick*, p. 460; English edit. p. 94.

1648 Trust committed to me by the honourable Lady Savile (the Relict of Sir William Savile<sup>1</sup>), a Person of incomparable Affection to his Majesty, of singular Prudence . . . and of great Interest and Power . . . by the adherence of many Persons of Honour, Ability, and Loyalty unto her, and particularly . . . my late Lord Langdale.' This refers to the distinguished Yorkshireman who had commanded the left wing at Naseby, and was at the moment of which we speak in retirement on the Continent.

The second Civil War, which lasted from April to August 1648, and was inaugurated by the secret treaty between Charles and the Scotch, offered to the energies of the friends a new field of operation. Langdale joined the Scots, who at the end of April crossed the Border; and the stratagem by which, upon the authority of his commission, Pontefract was surprised, is referred in 'Vita Barwick' to the inventive genius of Lady Savile.<sup>2</sup> The stronghold was immediately invested by the Parliamentary forces; but not, it seems, until a detachment had garrisoned Thornhill Hall.

'Whilst I was attending the enemy towards Nottinghamshire,' writes Sir Henry Cholmeley to the Speaker, July 22, 1648,<sup>3</sup> 'they drew out 200 of their foot from Pomfract and possessed themselves of Thornhill Hall, the late house of Sir William Saville, where they began to fortify, which, being of itself defended with a moat was soon made strong enough to be maintained till cannon should be brought against it. Upon Sunday morning last' (July 16) 'my own regiment of horse and Colonel Fairfax's regiment of foot marched up close to the House.' A summons to surrender on terms was, it would appear, met by a steady refusal, unless time should be allowed for consultation with the Pontefract leaders; and thus having been denied,<sup>4</sup> the Parliamentarians 'presently possessed themselves of some outhouses which the enemy endeavoured to maintain. The dispute was hot for about an hour, and in that time,' writes Sir Henry, 'we had eight or ten men slain and twenty wounded; the enemy had their share of loss likewise. That night and the next day we endeavoured to draw away the water from the moat, and by Tuesday morning it was well-nigh dried. I then sent a trumpet with some articles to them, but they refused them, and desired a treaty, upon which it was at the last concluded that they should march away leaving all

<sup>1</sup> 'Ea erat,' says a note (for the biography is written in Latin), 'illustrissimi Marchionis Hallifaxii mater,' p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> She was certainly a confederate (*Cal. Com. Adv. Mon.* p. 1018).

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 1, pp. 188-9.

<sup>4</sup> 'Sir I am Engaged to make good my proffer, the rendition of that house will forfeit noe loyalty, though(h) blood be pretious, yet we cannot conde-scend to soe long a cessation as to expect any answer from Pontefract, but a speedy surrender. Tho. Fairfax. From my quarters at Thornhill

their arms and ammunition bag and baggage behind them only 1648  
three horses and three swords being allowed to three of their  
officers. After the articles were signed, the enemy by accident  
fired their powder, which killed five of their men and blew up  
part of the house, which afterwards took fire, and burnt the  
house down to the ground.<sup>1</sup>

Thus ended the old mansion which had been for so many generations the chief seat of the Savile family.

Another month saw the annihilation of the Scots at Preston on their way to relieve Pontefract. Langdale was captured in Nottingham,<sup>2</sup> and a threat to execute him under the walls of Pontefract evoked from the garrison of that place one of the most daring counter-moves ever elaborated,<sup>3</sup> for the conception of which, if Barwick's biographer may be trusted, Lady Savile is again responsible. A detachment from the garrison actually succeeded in kidnapping the enemy's general, Rainsborough, within his own lines, that he might be detained as hostage for the safety of Langdale. A scuffle however ensued, in the course of which Rainsborough was killed;<sup>4</sup> and although the intrepid adventurers made their escape in safety, the position of Langdale became desperate. In this extremity the courage and address of Lady Savile triumphed anew; by skilful bribery and no less skilful intrigue she concerted the escape of the prisoner<sup>5</sup> and his flight to the Continent. Meanwhile Pontefract, the last refuge, if we mistake not, of Royalist resistance, maintained its independence until March, 1649, two months after the execution of Charles I.<sup>6</sup>

The large part played by Lady Savile in these exciting episodes appears to have been suspected by the Parliamentarians. Her ruin, we are told, was eagerly desired; but,

16 July 1648. To the Governour of Thornhill Hall. 'Sir You may not expect anything here but what you can winne by your swords, untill I receive further orders from my superiors, yours, Tho. Paulden' (*Savile-Finch Correspondence*, Add. MSS., British Museum, 28,569) (copy).

<sup>1</sup> This affair is carelessly reported in the public prints: 'July 26. . . . News came this day that the 600 horse and dragoons . . . sent by the way of Chester were come to Yorkshire, joynd with such as of that County were intended for Major-Gen. Lambert, had fallen upon the house of my Lord Savil's call'd Thorney House, garrisoned by those of Pomfret, taken it, fired it, and are gone Northerly' (July 20-27, 1648, *Moderate Intelligence*).

<sup>2</sup> See his letter in Bell's *Parliamentary Correspondence*, ii. 60.

<sup>3</sup> See *Barwick* (Latin edit. p. 66; English edit. p. 111); Paulden's account in *Somers Tracts* (1812, vii. 3).

<sup>4</sup> The Parliamentarians supposed that the murder had been deliberately planned. (See Oldmixon and others.)

<sup>5</sup> *Barwick*, Lat. edit. p. 67; Eng. edit. p. 112. See also *Cal. Com. Adv. Mon.* p. 1018.

<sup>6</sup> Several of the officers expiated on the scaffold the death of Rainsborough.

E-3289/21.255

1654 though every art was used to entrap her, she eluded the snares of her ill-wishers, and continued to afford the distressed Cavaliers, and the clergy in particular, a generous bounty.<sup>1</sup> The date of her second marriage, with Thomas Chichele of Wimpole, a Cambridgeshire Royalist,<sup>2</sup> has not transpired.

It seems probable that the influence of this remarkable woman was the principal factor in the early life of her distinguished son; nor can we doubt that, far as he subsequently declined from her strong episcopal sympathies and her exalted attachment to the House of Stuart,<sup>3</sup> he maintained in early life the tenets of his family.

In November 1654, two years after the battle of Worcester and nearly a year after Cromwell had accepted the Protectorate, Sir George Savile attained his majority. The early death of his father, leaving settled estates, and his own long minority, had protected in great measure his interests, and Sir George Savile found himself a wealthy man at a time when poverty was almost the distinguishing mark of the Cavalier.

Rufford, in Sherwood—which, so long as Thornhill had remained intact, had served the family as an occasional residence—had become, on the destruction of the more ancient seat,<sup>4</sup> the principal dwelling of the family. Originally an abbey of the Cistercian Order, it had been acquired in 1637 by the Talbots, to whose manor of

<sup>1</sup> *Burwick*, Lat. edit. p. 67; Eng. edit. p. 112. See also *Cal. Com. Adv. Mon.* p. 1018.

<sup>2</sup> Member of the Long Parliament, joined the King, sat in the Parliament at Oxford, and surrendered with that city. July 13, 1647, he compounded for a sum of 1,985*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.*, being the estimated tenth of an estate valued at 1,100*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* per annum. Personalty 50*l.* (*Commons' Journal*, October 3, 10, 1647; and Addenda to *Burwick*). About 1670 he obtained the control of the Ordnance (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi. part 5, p. 19), before which date he was knighted; he was a member of Parliament and a commissioner for the repair of St. Paul's. (See North's *Examen*, p. 52; Evelyn, July 27, 1666.) Pepys (March 11, 1673) mentions his splendid housekeeping 'in the French fashion,' his 'good discourse,' and attachment to the High Church party. Ashley Cooper remarks (letter to Christie) that 'my brother Chichele's' hospitality had resulted in a load of debt. He became Chancellor of the Duchy through his stepson Halifax in November 1682 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 373), and a year later is described as a vigorous man of seventy (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 366). In 1687, like his stepson Henry, he was disgraced for his opposition to Rome (Bramstone). A son, Sir John, distinguished himself in the first Dutch war; held office before and after the Revolution; retired, and died two or three years later. Whether he was a step-brother or half-brother to the Saviles does not appear.

<sup>3</sup> The comments on the policy of Charles in the *Notes on Bishop Williams* are in general unfavourable.

<sup>4</sup> The house at Thornhill seems to have been poor, though with a fine park (Strafford and Whitaker).

Workshop, it stood in a proximity no less inviting than 1654-56 did its dependency of Rotherham to their *■*allamshire estates;<sup>1</sup> and had passed, as we know, to the Saviles in right of the Lady Mary Talbot. There in the old monastic building, which, transformed by Elizabethan taste, lay hidden among the extensive woodlands that still marked the royal forest, the young baronet lived the life of an opulent country gentleman. He had his house in town within the most fashionable area; and either at this period or later he seems to have effected several improvements upon his demesne.<sup>2</sup>

How far he shared his mother's taste for political intrigue we cannot tell. He was certainly credited with Royalist proclivities, and in March 1655, the authorities<sup>3</sup> heard of an intended meeting at Rufford which aroused suspicion. Colonel Hacker, the troops quartered at Doncaster, and the Sheriff of Yorkshire were duly informed, but their investigations proved fruitless. Meanwhile Cromwell himself wrote enclosing further information,<sup>4</sup> in consequence of which a meeting was disturbed (whether at Rufford or no does not appear) and several gentlemen were arrested. 'Sir George Savill,' says the Protector's correspondent, 'is not at home; we have detained one Mr. Coventry, who is the lady Savill's brother,' until Sir George shall appear to your highness. He is said to be in London at his house in Lincoln's-inn-field,<sup>5</sup> at the corner of Queen Street, called Carlisle-house, or Savill-house. We can find nothing in his house, that gives any light; only we heare that one of his family, mr. Davidson, who is tutor to Sir George, was at the meetinge and stayed in the house till after dinner on fryday, and then went away. We cannot gett him. . . . We hope e're this goe away to give you an account of the pistolls.'

<sup>1</sup> For the history of Rufford, see Thoroton, *Notts.*, Hunter, *South Yorkshire*; *Thoresby MSS.* (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ix. 376-7); *Rufford MSS.* (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi. part 7); Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. 404, and Appendix. A Chartulary will be found among MSS. Harl. British Museum. The *Beauties of England and Wales* describes its sequestered position, the extent of the house, and the remains of monastic architecture which it in part displays. A fine Elizabethan hall and numerous portraits of the Savile family, including those of Lord Halifax and his immediate relations, are mentioned in vol. xii. part 1, p. 389.

<sup>2</sup> Thoroton, whose *History of Nottinghamshire* was published in 1675.

<sup>3</sup> Thurloe, *State Papers*, ix. 598. The paper, which is addressed to the Protector, has neither date nor signature. It seems to have been written from Thurgarton and is printed between letters of March 11 and 12, 1655.

<sup>4</sup> Both letters and information are unfortunately missing.

<sup>5</sup> Evidently William.

<sup>6</sup> One of the most fashionable situations before the building of St. James's Square (Dausent, p. 8).

1656-58

Two years later a treacherous servant who had been twenty-one years in the household of the Saviles, father and son, affected to give, in deposition before a magistrate, the real history of these transactions; and describes, disconnectedly indeed, but with a certain vividness, the secret preparation for a sudden march upon York, which had been, he averred, the real object of these clandestine consultations; how Rufford had been for months the meeting-place of gentlemen from Nottinghamshire, Wakefield, and Pontefract; how Sir George Savile himself had gone up to London to purchase pistols; and how horses, to the number of thirty-seven, stood for weeks in the stable at his expense. How arms had been secreted between the Abbey and the 'New Inn,' a quarter of a mile distant. How pistols had been left in the inn itself. How there came to the said 'New Inn,' as the landlady avers, 'three gentlemen, whom they did verily believe were Charles Stuart, the duke of York, and the duke of Gloucester, or the duke of Buckingham, and that Charles Stuart went in the habit of a groom to the other; the which said gentlemen had sack and claret brought from Sir George Savil's house to the inn.' How a fortnight later 'Mr. William Coventry, . . . he that was my lord Keeper's son,' had arrived post-haste from London; and how one of the grooms, despatched with letters, killed his horse by hard riding. How next night the men stood in the stables, with saddle and bridle hanging in every stall; how the company had repaired to the 'New Inn,' where other steeds were stabled, making a total of 200; and how an hour before midnight intelligence arrived that the Yorkshiremen could not be ready for some few days, and the enterprise was in consequence abandoned. How swords, pistols, and 'brave armour' lay still concealed in the Abbey, beneath a false floor and behind a chimney. How Sir George by his harshness concerning the assessments had so enraged the hostess of the 'New Inn' that she could find it in her heart to betray him.<sup>1</sup>

The value of these assertions cannot, of course, be tested. The information, however, has a real value, since it points to an early and intimate connection between Savile and the kinsman by whom he was always most strongly

<sup>1</sup> Thurloe, vii. 263, 301 (very incorrectly printed), and the originals in *Rawlinson MSS.* A. 60 (124 and 268), Bodleian Library (information of Edward Cockle or Cockhill, July 12 and July 30, 1658). For 'three' confederates, read 'there' (their); for 'Shurgerton,' read 'Thurgerton.' The name of Sir George Savile also occurs in an undated list of reputed Royalists (*Eg. MSS.*, Brit. Mus. 2541.362).

influenced. William Coventry was but seven years older 1656 than his nephew, and the Civil Wars had compelled him to quit his studies for the field.<sup>1</sup> He had followed the Princes into exile,<sup>2</sup> and had not returned until all hope of foreign assistance appeared futile.<sup>3</sup> His habitual abstention from the Royalist cabals—though Clarendon, writing under the shadow of a bitter subsequent enmity, so severely censures it—derives a valid excuse from the singularly repulsive picture of Cavalier society in the Fifties drawn by Clarendon himself; and suggests that Mr. Coventry attended the Rufford meeting in order to divert his nephew from the prosecution of so desperate an enterprise. If this was so, his pacific intentions do not seem to have secured him from the jealousy of the Government. Indeed, on a previous and similar occasion he had only averted arrest by absconding.<sup>4</sup>

It does not appear, however, that Sir George was ever molested; while on December 29, 1656,<sup>5</sup> at the age of twenty-three, after an abortive treaty with the exiled House of Butler,<sup>6</sup> he intermarried with another Royalist family. His bride, a girl of fifteen or sixteen,<sup>7</sup> who brought him 10,000*l.*,<sup>8</sup> was Dorothy, only daughter of Henry Spencer, first Earl of Sunderland, the gallant and accomplished young man who had fallen thirteen years before, at the age of twenty-three, in the Royalist ranks at Newbury.

This connection exerted a very appreciable influence over the subsequent career of Sir George. Concerning the lady herself very little is known. The allusions which occasionally confront us in the letters of her lively brother-in-law, Henry Savile, suggest that she was vivacious and agreeable, but nothing can be gleaned which throws any light on the relations between herself and her

<sup>1</sup> *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; Bramston's *Memoirs*.

<sup>2</sup> Clarendon, *Continuation of Hist.* ii. 201 (Oxford edition of 1827); *Cal. of Clarendon Papers*. Evelyn, October 2, 1649 ed. 1873, ii. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Clarendon.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* April 16, 1652 (variant); Coventry's own story in Grey's *Debates*, vi. 192; *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* June 28, 1655. Henry and Francis Coventry appear to have remained abroad (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, art. Henry Coventry; *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* August 22, 1653, p. 453). For John Coventry, Savile's trustee, see Ashley's autobiography; *Commons' Journal*, December 15, 1647; *Lords' Journal*, January 3, 1648; *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* May 10, 1650 (p. 153), March 11, 1650. See *Cal. Clarendon Papers* (Index).

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Secombe, art. in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (quoting *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1850, part 2, p. 367). (Excerpt from Register of St. Giles's in the Fields.)

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 414.

<sup>7</sup> She must have been born between the end of 1639 and September 1642.

<sup>8</sup> Release dated January 2, 1657, *Collins' Peerage*, 1812, i. 405, from the *Penshurst MSS.*



1656. 60 husband. Tier brother, Robert Earl of Sunderland—whose tortuous public career we shall have occasion to follow—was a good deal younger than Sir George, and more than twenty years elapsed before the political course of the brothers-in-law coincided. But her mother, Dorothy Lady Sunderland<sup>1</sup> (the ‘Sacharissa’ of Waller’s early poems), is celebrated as one of the most virtuous, charming, and beautiful women of her century; and the strong affection which she conceived for her son-in-law survived, undiminished, the death of her daughter and the remarriage of Savile. The politics of her own family rendered the match unpopular among the more ardent Cavaliers.<sup>2</sup> It is improbable that Sir George at this time had formed the acquaintance of her brother, the celebrated Colonel Algernon Sidney, one of the founders of modern Radicalism, who, as a convinced Republican, had retired from politics on the elevation of Cromwell. In later years, however, we shall trace an intercourse more or less familiar between Sidney and his nephew by marriage. The intimacy, on the other hand, between the Savile family and Algernon’s younger brother Henry (‘handsome Sidney,’ a boy junior by some years to Sir George) probably dates from this early period. Nor must we omit to mention that Ashley Cooper, who had also and finally broken with Cromwell, had contracted some fifteen months earlier<sup>3</sup> a (third) marriage with an aunt of the new Lady Savile. The connection between George Savile and the Dorsetshire baronet was therefore twofold.

\* Concerning the immediate family of Sir George himself, our information during these early years is scanty indeed. We notice the death of a brother and sister.<sup>4</sup> Henry, the remaining son, his brother’s junior by seven or eight years, entered Christ Church, Oxon, in 1657.<sup>5</sup> Anne, the only surviving daughter, married—probably about 1658—Thomas Windsor Hickman, afterwards seventh Lord Windsor, who had distinguished himself at the age of fifteen by escaping from the guardianship of the Parliament to throw in his lot with King Charles.

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy Sidney, daughter of the Earl of Leicester. She retained her title in spite of her marriage in 1652 with Robert Smythe of Bounds. (Miss Cartwright’s biography.)

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 399, Dec. 20, 1656 (misdated 1657. See *ibid.* p. 220).

<sup>3</sup> *Gentleman’s Magazine*, 1850, vol. ii. p. 367.

<sup>4</sup> Margaret and William. They are mentioned in their father’s will, but do not appear in the pedigree at the College of Arms signed by Sir George in 1660 (2 D. 14, 147, 205; there is a later pedigree of 1703, C. 34. f. 7, Notts, Cooper’s *Savile Correspondence*, Intro. pp. iii and vi). Foster (*Yorkshire Pedigrees*) says Margaret married John Pratt, Esq., and left issue.

<sup>5</sup> Subscribed April 21 (*Alumni Oxonienses*, iv. 1319).

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER II

*Notices relating to the Savile Estates, 1644-60*

- Transfer of land . . . 'Cal. St. Pap. Dom.,' July 7, 1658.  
Taylor's 'Wakefield,' p. 86.  
Brit. Mus. Add. MSS., 6668 (459)
- 'Cal. Com. Adv. Money,' p. 436 July 28, 1644. Assessment of 2,500*l.* laid on 'Sir William Savile.'
- 'Cal. Com. Comp.,' pp. 107, 113 'Sir William' under sequestration; produces Goldsmiths' Hall order for discharge.
- 'Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.,' vii. 37 July 15, 1648. The trustees apply for relief to the Committee for Sequestrations. Their profits are barred by sequestration, yet they are liable to the prosecution of the creditors. They point out that Savile was only tenant for life.
- (MSS. of House of Lords)
- 'Commons' Journal,' v. 637 Commons order the Committee for Sequestrations to report.
- 'Cal. Com. Adv. Money,' pp. 908, 925 The Savile trustees are compelled, July 1650, to pay up the balance of 500*l.* due from Sir William Savile as one of the signatories to the 'Magna Charta,' or 'Yorkshire engagement,' who had pledged their own credit in order to raise 300,000*l.* for Newcastle's military chest.
- 'Cal. Com. Comp.,' p. 2917 December 17, 1651. Estate of 'Sir William Savile' to be seized till he show cause why it should not be sequestrated.
- Ibid.* p. 2474 February 12, 1652. Estate of Sir William, with some lands held by him in trust, to be sequestrated.

*'Proceedings against Lady Savile,' in which her share in the sieges of Pontefract and Sheffield is mentioned.*

'Cal. Com. Adv. Money,' p. 1018 (February 10, 1649; July 4, 1649; July 22, 1650; January 21, 1652); 'Cal. Com. Comp.,' p. 532 (January 22, 1652).

## CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL LIFE—RELATIONS WITH  
LORD CHANCELLOR CLARENDON

1660—67

1659-60 WHETHER Sir George Savile was concerned in any of those complicated intrigues which preceded the Restoration, we cannot tell.<sup>1</sup> It is certain, however, that he, with Mr. William Lowther, represented Pontefract in the 'Convention Parliament' by which the Restoration was effected.<sup>2</sup> This assembly met April 25, and—having recalled the King, passed the 'Bill of Indemnity,' and settled the revenue—it dissolved December 24. No speech or motion on the part of Sir George Savile is recorded in the Parliamentary annals, if we except an attempt to secure damages from Lord Wharton, for which we may suppose him responsible.<sup>3</sup> In the second Parliament of Charles II., which met May 16 of the following spring (1661), and remained in being for nearly eighteen years, his place as member for Pontefract was taken by Sir John Downay.<sup>4</sup> His career in the Lower House was therefore of the briefest; but the fact itself long unnoticed—is not without interest.

<sup>1</sup> 'I am very glad,' writes Hyde to Barwick, November 21, 1659, 'you find the Baronet so well resolved. I have writ for a letter for him, which I shall send to you as soon as it comes to my Hands. I am glad you have an interest in Mr. Chichely.' (App. *Vita Barwick*.) Is 'the Baronet' Chichely's stepson? The 'letter' would be an appeal from Charles himself.

<sup>2</sup> Cobbett's *Parliamentary History*, iv. 8. There was a double return; but the opponents, John Hewley and Lionel Copley, were unseated by the Committee for Elections. It would appear that on one of the two cancelled indentures the names of Savile and of Hewley, Recorder of Pontefract, appear together (*Returns of Members of Parliament*, part 1, p. 517; Note from *Commons' Journal*, May 16, 1660).

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 98a, June 11, 1660: Papers relating to the Bill of Indemnity. Suggested proviso (57): 'that the Act shall not extend to the indemnifying Philip Lord Wharton as to the sum of 4,000*l.* or thereabout, which he has received out of the estate of Sir George Savile, Bart., since the year 1647.'

<sup>4</sup> Who appears to have represented the county in the Convention (Cobbett, iv. 198); created Viscount Down in 1680 (Markham's *Fairfax*, p. 382).

The Restoration, moreover, brought into action several persons with whom Sir George was immediately connected. Ashley Cooper, who had early joined the Restoration movement, was rewarded by a Peerage and the Chancellorship of the Exchequer; and when the King entered London, William Coventry headed the royal procession.<sup>1</sup> He had hastened to present his respects at Breda, where, finding the Duke of York in want of a secretary, he had obtained that appointment, which the Duke's position as Lord High Admiral of England rendered equally lucrative and important. Henry Coventry became a Gentleman of the Bedchamber; while Mr. Chichele, a few years later, bought a place in the Ordnance. On the other hand, Algernon Sidney, who, at the moment of the King's return, was Ambassador from the Commonwealth to Sweden, thought it wise to expatriate himself, and remained over seventeen years in exile. 1660

We catch some glimpses of the Savile connection during the period which immediately followed the Restoration. The Dowager Lady Savile<sup>2</sup> did not long survive the re-establishment of the family to whose service her life had been in so great measure devoted. Barwick's biographer declares that grief at the riot and profanity which marked the restored economy hastened her end; and that, while she had risen superior to peril and apprehension, she 'fell an easy prey to a melancholy disorder, fomented by the wickedness of a thankless generation.' In May 1662, she wrote that she had long been ailing;<sup>3</sup> and 'perceiving her illness to increase daily' she 'left London, and repaired to Wimpole,' where, having 'summoned from London her friend Barwick,' 'she soon after' gave up her great and innocent soul to God.' On July 31, 1662, 'Lady Saville, the wife of

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii. part 7, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> We regret that reasons of space forbid us to insert any of the letters written by Lady Savile to Henry Savile, which are in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 28,569, *Letters of the Savile and Finch Families*, 1626-1720). They are dated February 16 (1660?); this letter is addressed to Christ Church, Oxford; May 25 (1660?); June 28 (1660?); October 29 (1660?); November 9 (1660?); October 26 (1661?); May 5 (1662?). They are marked by strong affection and strong religious feeling, and are not devoid of wit.

<sup>3</sup> Letter to Henry Savile, London, May 5 (1662?) (*Savile-Finch Correspondence*). Henry was abroad.

<sup>4</sup> Who had been appointed Dean of St. Paul's and became Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, February 16, 1661 (Kennett, *in.* 234, 254). He died unmarried October 22, 1664 (*Vita*, p. 237; Eng. edit. p. 312). He is mentioned by Baxter (*Relique*, ii. 276) as a silent assistant at a conference with Presbyterians soon after the Restoration.

<sup>5</sup> *Vita Barwick*, Lat. edit. pp. 227-8; Eng. edit. pp. 328-9.

1661-62 Thomas Chicheley, Esq<sup>re</sup>., was buried in the new vault<sup>1</sup> of Wimpole church.<sup>1</sup>

She had lived, however, long enough to welcome the birth of two grandsons—George, who died within the year;<sup>2</sup> and Henry, born at Rufford, February 1661, a month after his brother's death.<sup>3</sup> The young uncle, heir-presumptive deposed, of whom he was the namesake, and who had left England for a foreign tour, acknowledges the compliment in a good-natured letter, suggestive of previous (and no doubt extremely well-deserved) elder brotherly admonitions.<sup>4</sup> For 'Harry' Savile was emphatically the charming, kindly scapegrace who tries to the utmost the patience of his friends and never forfeits their affection.<sup>5</sup> Sweet-tempered, indolent, witty, fond of pleasure, careless of consequences, his letters<sup>6</sup> reveal to us the best of good fellows, the most delightful correspondent of his age. His debts, his follies, his escapades, and, after he had obtained a small appointment at Court, his periodic intervals of disgrace,<sup>7</sup> were a constant source of anxiety to the family at large; while once at least he was compelled to take refuge from obloquy and his creditors, in his beloved Paris.<sup>8</sup> But whether imploring in a highly penitent and lugubrious strain the good offices of a favourite uncle,<sup>9</sup> or insinuating with delicious effrontery that a 'fatted buck' would appropriately grace the return of the 'prodigal nephew';<sup>10</sup> whether dilating with amusing solemnity upon

<sup>1</sup> *Wimpole Registers*.

<sup>2</sup> *The Genealogist* (S.S.), x. 161.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*: Pedigree.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1, April 1661.

<sup>5</sup> See a letter from William Coventry to T. Thynne (April 9, 1673, *Longleat MSS.*): 'Poore H. Sa. I am heartily glad he is in noe hazard, but am infinitely troubled at the thing, not that a quarrell (and even a drunken one) is an extraordinary thing, but because hee still relapses from his most solemn resolutions, and till hee can overcome the matter of wine, and totally abstaine from it, I reckon such consequences as these his most inseparable companions, and doe prepare not to bee surprised at even worse then these, though I shall hee infinitely grieved when it comes, for I cannot but love the good nature kinnesse and many other good qualities hee hath, w<sup>th</sup> noe allayes but such as tend in the first place to his own ruine, and as such (only) molest his friends.'

<sup>6</sup> *Savile Correspondence*; *Longleat MSS.* (letters to Henry and William Coventry, &c.); Ellis, *Original Letters* (2nd ser.), iv. 58.

<sup>7</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 23; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 513; *Halton Correspondence*, i. 68; *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 26-29; Lord Windsor to Lord Halifax, *Spencer MSS.* 31 (14), dated November 4, 1672; Sir William Coventry to T. Thynne, November 23, 1672, April 9, 1673 (*Longleat MSS.*); *Lady Russell's Letters* (1819), p. 177; *ibid.* (1853) i. 26; *Halton Correspondence*, i. 129, 130; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vi. 379. He was present at the sea fight of June 1672, and his account has been often printed.

<sup>8</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 513, September 1671; letters to William Coventry, Paris, Dec. 15, 1671, Jan. 16, 1671<sup>1</sup> (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>9</sup> *Longleat MSS.*, Dec. 15, 1671, Jan. 16, 1671<sup>1</sup> (to W. Coventry).

<sup>10</sup> Reference lost.

projects of study and retirement,<sup>1</sup> or ingenuously betray- 1662  
ing a renewed and vivid interest in life and frivolity, the  
good-natured ne'er-do-well failed not to repay, with a  
warm and almost passionate loyalty, the unvarying kind-  
ness of his elder brother.<sup>2</sup> For politics, save as they  
affected the passing and precarious interests of Mr. Henry  
Savile, that young gentleman in his earlier days cared  
extremely little. It was not till he had expiated the follies  
of a very protracted youth that he developed, as English  
representative at Versailles, both energy and patriotism,  
with an honourable and perhaps somewhat honorary  
attachment to the Protestant religion which, under  
James II., was to cost him a place.

In the elder brother meanwhile early responsibility  
had apparently developed a hereditary love of business,  
with a prudence and a foresight which were rather a  
Coventry than a Savile characteristic.

From the first, it is evident, the young baronet as-  
sumed a prominence which is not surprising. His wealth,  
his vast estates,<sup>3</sup> his local importance, his 'orderly and  
splendid way of living,' and his Ministerial connections  
lent him an initial distinction, while his intellectual super-  
iority, and in especial his brilliant conversational powers,<sup>4</sup>  
soon attracted attention. 'Came to visit me' (records  
Evelyn, September 27, 1662) 'S<sup>r</sup> Geo. Savell, Grandson  
to y<sup>e</sup> learned Sir Hen. Savell.<sup>5</sup> . . . S<sup>r</sup> Geo. was a

<sup>1</sup> To his brother, February 14, 167<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> (misdated 167<sup>2</sup>/<sub>2</sub>) (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 35).

<sup>2</sup> See their correspondence, from which we shall frequently quote. As illustrating their relations in these earlier days, we may specially refer to certain letters of Henry to his brother on joining the fleet in 1665 (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 13, 14), and another written in 1670, when the younger brother was attempting to stand for one of the Nottinghamshire boroughs, and had applied in vain for his senior's interest (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 25, 26): ' . . . I cannot but a little wonder that those who do so often advise me to apply myself to business should be so unwilling I should appear upon so considerable a stage of it as the House of Commons . . . it being the only act of your life to me that has not savoured of the most perfect and most tender kindness.' For his brother he professes 'all the submission, all the deference, and all the most perfect kindness that one man is capable of having for another.'

<sup>3</sup> For a list of his estates, see Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> 'I suppose y<sup>e</sup> will not expect sense from me, who comes from having heard L<sup>d</sup> Hallifax entertain S<sup>r</sup> J<sup>n</sup> Finch two houres in most exquisite nonsense' (Thomas Thynne to W. Coventry, January 25, 167<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, *Longleat MSS.*). 'His Lordship's eloquence was very natural and very extraordinary, whether in discourse or writing. They that have heard him speak can attest the first. . . . And one great argument of the prodigious depth and quickness of his sense is, that many of his observations and wise sayings were on the sudden, when talking to a friend or going from him' (*Saviliana*).

<sup>5</sup> This genealogy is, of course, incorrect.

1663 witty gentleman, if not a little too prompt<sup>1</sup> and daring.' He lived much in London;<sup>2</sup> was regarded as a likely aspirant for a seat in the House of Lords; and formed early in the day certain intimacies which, by involving him in the political cabals of the moment, at first impeded as they afterwards advanced his interests. For during the first few years of the Restoration era we find him confidentially connected with his uncle William Coventry and with the Duke of Buckingham, both of whom, by a rapidly increasing political influence, had early incurred the jealousy of Lord Chancellor Clarendon.

We have already pointed out that, despite the accident which had led Sir George to settle on his Nottinghamshire estate, he was by birth and interests essentially a Yorkshireman. We find him acting with other local magnates as a commissioner<sup>3</sup> for the execution of the Corporation Act within the city and county of York; and he held his appointment as Deputy-Lieutenant and colonel of a Militia regiment<sup>4</sup> under the Lord-Lieutenant of the West Riding, the celebrated or notorious Duke of Buckingham. The keen and vigorous wit of Savile no doubt exerted its fascination over the no less brilliant intellect of the vivacious Duke, and the relations between them seem early to have passed the purely business stage.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. 1879, ii. 152. More than thirty years later, recording the death of Lord Halifax, Evelyn (*ibid.* iii. 121) repeats and explains his criticism. 'Lord H. was a very rich man, very witty, and in his younger days somewhat positive' (i.e. dogmatic, opinionated).

<sup>2</sup> 'Twere somewhat improper,' writes his sister (Lady Windsor) playfully, 'for a country gentlewoman to expect so high a peice of courtship as your coming to Kidderminster to owne mee for your Vallentine. . . . My brother Harry tells me you may possibly make this your way to London as you returne out of the north. greater hopes hee will not give mee' (April 3. 1663, *Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 14). 'Harry,' she adds, 'is so good company that wee are loath to part with him.' By December, however, we find Henry at Madrid, sending home witty and pathetic accounts of the miserable accommodation which the Spanish capital afforded (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 3). With him were the young Lord Sunderland, brother of Lady Dorothy Savile, and Henry Sidney, her still more youthful uncle. Sunderland had just commenced a varied career by taking part within 'Tom Quad,' Christ Church, in a riotous protest against the re-introduction of surplices. In consequence he and his friend William Penn, afterwards distinguished as the leader of the Quakers and the founder of Pennsylvania, had been expelled.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* viii. 275, dated February 1663. The list contains most of the great Yorkshire names, including those of Buckingham, Heresby of Thrybergh, Osborne of Kiveton, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Whitaker, *Loudis and Elmele*, p. 106, &c.; *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* 1663-64, p. 229. On the occasion of the 'Farley Wood' disturbances in 1663 the Yorkshire forces were called out, and the Duke as Lord-Lieutenant was joined at Pontefract by 'Sir George Savile and the rest of the most considerable persons of this country.' Colonel Frecheville to the Marquis of Newcastle, October 11, 1663 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 2, p. 144).

Among those younger members of the provincial aristocracy who clustered round the distinguished favourite—the Osbornes,<sup>1</sup> the Ogles,<sup>2</sup> the Reresbys<sup>3</sup>—Sir George held a conspicuous place, no less from his natural gifts than from the influence he was supposed to possess over the mind of the great man. In this connection the letters of Lord Mansfield, afterwards Lord Ogle, son of Sir William Savile's old commander, the Marquis of Newcastle, are peculiarly interesting.<sup>4</sup> They teem with the expressions of an enthusiastic attachment which advancing years and political differences soon annulled. The writer acknowledges with rapture the letters of his friend; vows that he will preserve them in life, and leave them to his heir after death; he loves Savile the best of any friend he has, and 'would be a rogne' if he did not do so; confides entirely in his judgment;<sup>5</sup> and inquires anxiously after his health and his 'young great concerns.'<sup>6</sup>

'I suppose,' he writes,<sup>7</sup> 'you hard by ye last post my Ld Buckingham was made Precedent of ye North a wensday last.' I begg you will thinke of your frends I can offer noe thing to your consideration as to yourselfe in it, noe thing is above you upon true mesure, but I heare my L<sup>d</sup> Bellasis desires the Vice Precedentship, our frend S<sup>r</sup> Tho Osborne will wayt of you shortly if you be not Vice Precedent some of ye Lords will have it.'<sup>8</sup>

Mansfield's information, however, is here incorrect. Buckingham had pretended to the post and had been refused, a check which, ascribed as it was to the influence of Clarendon, created an open breach between the Duke and the Minister.<sup>10</sup> This enmity, as will be easily understood,

<sup>1</sup> Sir Thomas Osborne of Kiveton (son of Sir William Savile's old enemy the Vice-President), successively created Viscount Osborne of Dunblaine, Viscount Latimer of Danby, Earl of Danby, Marquis of Carmarthen, Duke of Leeds—the early friend and subsequent lifelong rival of Savile.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Mansfield was eldest son of the Marquis of Newcastle, who received a dukedom in 1665, and is best known, perhaps, for his treatise on horsemanship and the eccentricities of his Duchess, dear to all readers of Lamb. The son, on the father's elevation, assumed the courtesy title of Ogle. Welbeck is, of course, within easy distance of Rufford.

<sup>3</sup> Sir John Reresby, of Thrybergh, afterwards one of Savile's most attached and confidential followers, from whose *Memoirs* so much information concerning Halifax is derived.

<sup>4</sup> *Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 34.

<sup>5</sup> April 22, 1665.

<sup>6</sup> September 16, 1664, signed 'your devoted obliged servt.'

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 293.

<sup>9</sup> Enthusiastic also, even to the point of servility, is a letter from Cornbury, afterwards second Earl of Clarendon (letter book, *Spencer MSS.*).

<sup>10</sup> Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 293.



1660-67 gave from the first a political significance to the friendship between Buckingham and Savile; but we must lay somewhat further stress on a probable, though secondary, consequence of the intimacy.

The Duke at this time had not indeed attained to the height of licentious profligacy which soon rendered his name a by-word; but the society which he gathered around him was never, we may presume, remarkable for its sobriety. Against Sir George, strange to relate, the charge of personal licence<sup>1</sup> does not seem to have been adduced by contemporary writers. But the Buckingham symposiums were calculated to develop a turn for the irreverent sarcasms, the heterodox speculations, by which Savile earned for himself, after the manner of Montaigne, a reputation for atheism. 'He was,' says Burnet,<sup>2</sup> 'a man of a great and ready wit; full of life and very pleasant;'<sup>3</sup> much turned to satire. He let his wit run much on matters of religion: so that he passed for a bold and determined atheist.' Whether this inference actually reflects the real opinion of his youth we cannot say; but the supposition derives some force from his own observation<sup>4</sup> that religious disbelief, or at least religious indifference, 'is too natural in the beginnings of life to be heavily censured.'<sup>5</sup> Moreover, it is abundantly clear that Savile, to the last, was never orthodox according to the canons of any existing school;<sup>6</sup> and that to a strong taste for religious speculation and an acute sceptical intellect he joined a scorn of cant and bigotry, a contempt for party shibboleths, a 'keen eye for the failings of the clergy, and a very sarcastic tongue. Reserved to excess in the business of life, guarded to a fault in the most private correspondence, the caution of Savile failed him in conversation and in debate. He was through life incapable of suppressing an epigram, however pungent or profane; and his most startling paradoxes were, no doubt, often accepted by

<sup>1</sup> We do not, of course, argue from this negative testimony that his private reputation was unblemished. It is, however, a curious fact that Burnet, who is by no means sparing in the charge of personal immorality, and who, at the period when his *History* was composed, was strongly prejudiced against Savile, with whom he had been intimately acquainted, not only refrains from any such charge against him, but intimates that he was very estimable in social relations.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist.* (edit. 1833) i. 491-2.

<sup>3</sup> As we should say, 'amusing.'

<sup>4</sup> *Character of Charles II.*

<sup>5</sup> But see Mompesson's letter, September 1666 (preface).

<sup>6</sup> Burnet's definition of orthodoxy was not, according to seventeenth-century standards, by any means stringent, yet in letters written when their earlier intimacy was at its height (see chap. vii.) we trace the divine's anxiety for the conversion of a friend whose religious standpoint arouses apprehension.

his more literal acquaintances (Burnet was essentially prosaic) as the expression of a matured conviction. Nor do we need the authority of Bacon to convince us that criticism of current dogmas is frequently transmuted into evidence of impiety by the resentment of devotees. The charge of atheism, it is certain, Lord Halifax in later life vehemently repelled.<sup>1</sup> This urgency, together with the respect for religion evinced in his published tracts, may be, of course, interpreted as an astute and tardy concession to popular prejudice; and it may be specially argued, as regards his 'Advice to a Daughter,' that men, themselves irreligious, have seen in religious sanctions a convenient safeguard for the virtue of their womankind. But some curious reminiscences which we shall print in full later on certainly confirm Macaulay's impression that Halifax—at any rate, towards the close of his life—was at heart more religiously disposed than the majority of his contemporaries. In confidential circles he seems to have afforded occasional glimpses of a personal belief, sincere, elevated, and somewhat rationalistic—of a Christianity tinged indeed with the Epicureanism of the approaching eighteenth century, but not without curious approximation to later and loftier developments. In the excesses of his anti-Papal bitterness we trace the prejudices of his age; towards the sacerdotal assumptions of the Laudian school, of which his mother had been so devout a disciple, he showed himself a consistent and a satirical opponent; and, politically speaking, he evidently sympathised, especially on points which concerned the relations between the Establishment and the Dissenters, with Churchmen of the school of Tillotson, Tenison, and Burnet. His Latitudinarianism was, no doubt, assisted by the example of Buckingham—an advocate, from opposition to Clarendon, for the claims of the Dissenters—and by the influence of Savile's favourite mentor,<sup>2</sup> his uncle William Coventry, who, despite the sneers of Clarendon, appears to have been a consistent champion of ecclesiastical moderation.

The history of this remarkable man has yet to be written.<sup>3</sup> At the age of thirty-four the Restoration had introduced him to public life. His ability is unquestioned.

<sup>1</sup> 'He often protested to me, he was not' (an Atheist), 'and said, he believed there was not one in the world' (Burnet, as above).

<sup>2</sup> 'My brother,' writes Henry Savile to Sir William, December 15, 1671 (*Longleat MSS.*) '... is too wise a man to let anything be concealed from you that concerns either himself or his friends.'

<sup>3</sup> The materials for an adequate appreciation of Coventry have never been collected. His papers are divided between the Longleat collection (see

1660-67 Burnet describes him as a man 'of great notions and eminent virtues' . . . capable of bearing the chief ministry, as it was once thought he was very near it.'<sup>1</sup> 'His parts,' says Clarendon, in a passage<sup>2</sup> where the writer's sense of justice and hearty dislike of Coventry contended one with another after a fashion sufficiently suggestive, 'were very good, if he had not thought them better than any other man's; and he had diligence and industry, which men of good parts are too often without, which made him quickly to have at least credit and power enough with the duke' (of York), to whom he had been appointed secretary, 'and he was without those vices which were too much in request, and which make men most unfit for business.'

In another and later passage<sup>3</sup> Clarendon completes his picture, and dilates with all his prolix eloquence on the self-confidence of Coventry, his love of criticism, combativeness in debate, his 'pride and insolence,' with the want of principles 'in religion or state,' which rendered him 'of one mind this day, and another to-morrow.' Nor is it difficult to trace under the portraiture, coloured though it be by a passion which falls little short of hatred, the outlines of a character with which that of Savile, as the event proved, had much in common. A singular independence of spirit,<sup>4</sup> a breadth of mind which refused to be contracted by party formulas, a sanity which was proof against the contagion of national delirium, were equally characteristic of uncle and nephew. As regards brilliance of style, originality, imaginative insight, and intellectual subtlety, Sir George was indeed undoubtedly the superior; but it is probable that Coventry exceeded in administrative ability.

*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iii. and iv.) and the Malet papers, now in the British Museum; a few are in the Devonshire House collection. There is an excellent article on Coventry in the *Saturday Review* of October 11, 1873, and another in the *Dict. of National Biog.*; both, it is understood, from the pen of Mr. Christie. Naturally they do not pretend to be exhaustive. Our own conclusions have been formed by comparing the estimates of Clarendon and Pepys, of Burnet and James II., with the letters of Coventry to his nephews George Savile and Thomas Thynne, in the Spencer and Longleat collections.

<sup>1</sup> *History*, ed. 1833, i. 306.

<sup>2</sup> *Continuation of Hist.* 1827, ii. 202.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 460-1.

<sup>4</sup> See Pepys' account of the occasion when Coventry severed his connection with the navy, September 2, 1667. In the course of the long conversation which ensued, Coventry specially reprobated the idea that he had caballed with the King's mistress, Lady Castlemaine. He asserted his determination never to 'truckle under any body or any faction,' and to act 'just as his own reason and judgment' should direct. 'When he cannot use that freedom,' quotes Pepys, 'he will have nothing to do in public affairs' (Wheatley's edition, vii. 93).

Of his official excellence no better testimony can be desired than that of Pepys.<sup>1</sup> Young, able, energetic, and dowered with an ambition which Clarendon unkindly stigmatises as boundless, Coventry had entered upon his duties at the Admiralty, where his influence was greatly increased by his appointment in May 1662 as a Commissioner for the Navy, in a spirit of reforming zeal. He did not, however, confine his attention to purely official matters; he had represented Yarmouth from the beginning of the Parliament 'with,' says Clarendon, 'very much the reputation of an able man' and a good speaker;<sup>2</sup> and it was in this sphere that the antagonism between himself and the Chancellor, which had been apparent from the first,<sup>3</sup> reached a climax.<sup>4</sup> 1660-65

No formal Opposition existed for some years after the Restoration; but it was customary to acquaint a little knot of trusty members with the intentions of the Government. Of this department Clarendon had himself assumed the responsibility, and a certain venerable Sir Hugh Pollard acted as his lieutenant. Against this arrangement, conscious of his own increasing ascendancy, Coventry rebelled, and it soon became evident that he aspired to the management of the King's business in the Lower House. Clarendon with his imperious jealousy of the younger generation—a jealousy excusable in one who for years had represented the statesmanlike element in the exiled Court, and opposition to whom had been so frequently identified with unscrupulous intrigue—endeavoured to repress the energetic official, and only succeeded in adding another to the phalanx of mutinous talent, which perhaps already included Buckingham<sup>5</sup> and Arlington.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pepys, May 8, 15; June 3, 7, 10, 12; July 2, 31; October 30, 1662; February 2, 1663; August 8, 1663. (Wheatley's edition, ii. 232, 235, 249, 252, 253, 255, 273, 293, 380; iii. 29, 241.)

<sup>2</sup> 'He spake pertinently, and was always very acceptable and well heard' (*Con. Hist.* ii. 203). Burnet (i. 306) declares he was the best speaker in the House.

<sup>3</sup> Clarendon, *State Papers*, iii. 68, 70, 74, 77, 161; *Cal. of Clarendon Papers in the Bodleian*, ii. 132, 138, &c.; May 11, 1652–April 1653, Paris, &c. (Clarendon regarded him with jealousy and suspicion, as a man 'of good parts' but 'void of all religion.')

<sup>4</sup> *Con. Hist.* ii. 203–211.

<sup>5</sup> In consequence of the disappointment concerning the Presidency, already mentioned, in 1664.

<sup>6</sup> Returned from a mission to Spain, 1661; sworn of the Privy Council about October 1662; and succeeded Nicholas as Secretary of State about October 13 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, p. 29). The violence of Coventry's opposition and the closeness of his relations with Arlington are exaggerated by the fallen statesman brooding over the incidents which had preceded his fall. (Compare Pepys, June 24, 1663, and Coventry to Sir George Savile, with Clarendon, ii. 208–9, &c.)

1665 The advent of the naval war with the States,<sup>1</sup> a result in the main of commercial jealousy,<sup>2</sup> intensified these differences by exaggerating the importance of the Duke's secretary : and shortly before<sup>3</sup> the great victory off Lowestoffe, June 3, at which he was present, Coventry, despite the remonstrances of Clarendon, received the honour of knighthood and a seat in the Privy Council.

The Great Plague at the moment raged in London with such awful severity that the Court was on the eve of departure for Salisbury. The Duke and Duchess, however, at the last moment,<sup>4</sup> and, as Clarendon maintains, by the influence of Coventry,<sup>5</sup> decided to make York their headquarters. There they spent the whole summer 'in great lustre . . . with the very great respect and continual attendance of all the persons of quality of that large county.'<sup>6</sup> The visit proved a turning-point in the career of Sir George Savile : among the local magnates he was, of course, conspicuous ; he entertained the Duke with great splendour at Rufford ;<sup>7</sup> and in return the instances of William Coventry procured for the young baronet, from the Duke's own mouth, the promise of a peerage.<sup>8</sup>

In September, upon leaving York, the Duke repaired to Oxford, where, in consequence of the continued prevalence of the plague in London, Parliament was to meet. He lost no time in consulting the Chancellor,<sup>9</sup> whose daughter,

<sup>1</sup> March 1664.

<sup>2</sup> Halifax ascribed too much influence to the intrigues of France. (Compare *Character of a Treasurer* and von Ranke's *Englische Geschichte*, ed. 1859-68, iv. 279.) Clarendon and Coventry (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* v. 315 ; Pepys, v. 346) dispute responsibility for the war. Pepys corroborates Coventry.

<sup>3</sup> March 3, 1665 (Wheatley's Pepys, iv. 447, note). Pepys, June 21, 28, 1665. Clarendon misdates this by three months.

<sup>4</sup> July 27 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 485a).

<sup>5</sup> Who had 'no mind to be in so great a court that his greatness would not appear' (Clarendon, ii. 405). But it appears that the disposition of the fleet and the fear of disturbances in the North rendered the arrangement a natural one.

<sup>6</sup> Clarendon, ii. 125 ; and Keresby. It was here that 'Handsome Sidney,' of the Duke's Bedchamber, uncle of Lady Dorothy Savile, betrayed an impertinent passion for the Duchess, which ruined him at Court. (See also Bell's *Fairfax Correspondence*, ii. 249.)

<sup>7</sup> See *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 47. Among the *Spencer MSS.* 31 (34) is a letter from the old Duke of Newcastle (September 9, 1665) to Savile relative to an invitation from himself to the Duke of York ; its tone is highly complimentary.

<sup>8</sup> March 7, 1665, Lord Mansfield, writing in the first place to inform Savile of the Dukedom conferred on the Newcastle family, adds, 'I begg you will thinke now of desiring yt I am sure none deserves more then you and your family doth' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [34]).

<sup>9</sup> Clarendon, *Con. Hist.* ii. 454. Clarendon mentions two suits ; but as one of them involved the admission of Coventry to the Council, which had

be it remembered, he had married; and forthwith informed the Minister that himself and his wife 'were equally engaged, to prevail with the king to make sir George Savile a viscount.' He said 'he knew well the resolution the king had taken, to which he had contributed his advice, to make no more lords: but . . . that sir George had one of the best fortunes of any man in England, and lived the most like a great man; that he had been very civil to him and his wife in the north, and treated them at his house in a very splendid manner; and that he was engaged to prevail with the king in this point or to confess he had no power.'

1665

•Such an application, in favour of one who was at once the nephew of Coventry and the friend of Buckingham, cannot have failed to excite the displeasure of Clarendon. He remonstrated 'with his usual freedom; ' deprecated in general the departure from an established rule; and insisted in particular that 'Sir George Savile was a man of a very ill-reputation amongst men of piety and religion, and was looked upon as void of all sense of religion, even to the doubting, if not denying, that there is a God, and that he was not reserved in any company to publish his opinions: which made him believe that it would neither be for his highness's honour to propose it, nor for the king's to grant it, in a time when all licence in discourse and in actions was spread over the kingdom, to the heart-breaking of very many good men.'

The scruples of Clarendon, which were no doubt perfectly genuine, did not, however, impress the Duke of York, who repeated that 'he was resolved to use all his credit with the king to compass it,' and expressed a hope that Clarendon would not interfere.<sup>1</sup>

In a private audience therefore, at which Clarendon alone was present, the Duke preferred his request. He 'spoke much of the great interest that sir George Savile had in the northern parts, of the greatness of his estate, and his orderly and splendid way of living, and concluded with his desire "that his majesty would make him an English viscount."' He confessed, moreover, 'that he had given Sir George Savile cause to believe that he would prevail in that suit.'<sup>2</sup>

taken place three months earlier, it is evident that he misplaces that circumstance.

<sup>1</sup> The Duchess also appealed to her father, 'with more importunity' than the Duke.

<sup>2</sup> Clarendon, *Com. Hist.* ii. 457.

1665 We do not find that Charles endorsed the religious objection, but he, in common with Clarendon, acknowledged the inconvenience of the precedent; and, in fine, the favour was refused.<sup>1</sup> The Duke evinced considerable mortification; he ascribed his brother's unwonted resolution to the Chancellor's influence, and 'thought it necessary to inform Mr. Coventry, who had principally advanced this pretence, all that had passed before the king, that his nephew (for so sir George Savile was) might see he could make no further progress in it.'<sup>2</sup>

Nor was this all; 'in his passion' the Duke betrayed to Coventry the form of the Chancellor's objections, which were of course duly repeated; and ended, as a mark of his sympathy for the disappointed family, by taking into his bedchamber, in Clarendon's disdainful phrase, 'a younger brother of sir George Savile, whom he had only seen in the north'<sup>3</sup> . . . who being a young man of wit, and incredible confidence and presumption, omitted no occasion to vent his malice against the chancellor, with a license that in former times would have been very penal, *though it had concerned a person of a much inferior quality in the state.*<sup>4</sup> There is something delightfully characteristic in this sonorous complaint, and one pictures with rather unholy glee lively Impudence at the heels of injured and impotent Dignity. The Saviles were thus - through Buckingham, through Coventry, and on their own account - trebly connected with the party opposed to Lord Chancellor Clarendon;<sup>5</sup> nor can the episode have improved the relations between Coventry and the Chancellor.

Despite Lord Clarendon's opposition, the ascendancy of Sir William increased, and he was soon admitted to that Committee for Foreign Affairs or Cabal which formed the germ of the modern Cabinet.<sup>6</sup> The ill success of the war, by affording extensive scope for official recrimination, only aggravated Ministerial feuds; and the burden of responsibility fell upon the Navy Office, which was crippled

<sup>1</sup> This episode is mentioned by the Duke himself (Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 141). He seems to ascribe the subsequent patent to his own influence, and stigmatises the later opposition of Halifax as very ungrateful. Macaulay also refers to the incident, *History of England*, ed. 1858, p. 364, note. He does not seem to realise that the Savile in question is identical with Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> Clarendon, *Con. Hist.* ii. 459.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. Harry Savile.

<sup>4</sup> Clarendon, ii. 459.

<sup>5</sup> For a report that peerages were to be conferred upon Savile and Coventry, see *Cal. St. Pap. Dom.* 1665-66, p. 398 (May 15, 1666); Lady Windsor to Henry Savile (British Museum, *Add. MSS.* 28,569, f. 28, June 27, 1666); Pepys, October 14, 1666, Wheatley's edition, vol. vi. p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Clarendon, *Con. Hist.* ii. 460-1.

by the working of two great evils.<sup>1</sup> Financial pressure had from the first<sup>2</sup> embarrassed the restored Government. For political reasons, moreover, the efficient commanders who, under the fostering care of Cromwell, had risen from the ranks were replaced by ignorant young courtiers; and these men, at once devoted to pleasure and impatient of restraint, subverted in too many cases the discipline they were appointed to maintain.<sup>4</sup> The consequences were naturally disastrous, and the seamen—ill paid, ill fed, ill commanded, many of them illegally pressed<sup>5</sup>—deserted in crowds,<sup>6</sup> or sank into a cowardly dejection.<sup>7</sup> Coventry, disgusted with a system which he was powerless to reform,<sup>8</sup> did not affect to conceal his mortification.<sup>9</sup> 1665

His intimacy with Sir William no doubt in some measure explains the strong interest which Sir George Savile through life displayed in naval affairs. The importance of our maritime supremacy was a point of which he never lost sight. Some experimental knowledge of seamanship, he declared, should form a necessary part

<sup>1</sup> See Pepys, June 28, 1662, for the alarm which the prospect of a breach excited in departmental circles (Wheatley's edition, ii. 270).

<sup>2</sup> Owing (a) to the increasing demands of administration; (b) the careless manner in which the taxes were collected; (c) arrears accumulating during the two years of anarchy which had preceded the Restoration; (d) the huge liabilities incurred by the exiled King; (e) the extravagant and profligate expenditure of the Court, which lent a very sinister colour to the frequent demands for extraordinary supply; and (f) the corruption and inefficiency of the officials. For the difficulties of the Naval Office in this respect, see Pepys, December 29, 1662; February 18, March 21, 1663; December 3, 1663; October 15, 1665 (ii. 427, iii. 44, 72, 265, v. 116). The actual receipts from the extraordinary supplies voted by Parliament were much lessened by the occurrence of the Plague and Fire of London (Clarendon). See also Pepys, September 9, October 31, 1665 (v. 70, 132).

<sup>3</sup> See Pepys, *passim*; and a valuable article by M. Oppenheim in the *Historical Review* of January 1896; also *Memorials of Sir W. Penn*, ii. 293-4.

<sup>4</sup> Pepys, June 24, 1663 (iii. 178); June 27, 1662 (ii. 268); July 2, 1662 (ii. 273); June 2, 1663 (iii. 155); January 10, 1665 (v. 194); June 7, 10, 1666 (v. 316, 320); July 1, 21, 27, October 28 (v. 354, 369, 370, 377; vi. 10, 11); October 20, 1666 (vi. 29-32), viii. 280, 332. (See also Burnet.) His enemies accused Coventry of fomenting the evil by the sale of places. It does not appear that he did more than receive presents which had long been a perquisite of his post, and he constantly alleged that he was the first to abolish the indecent practice by introducing a regular scale of fees, &c.—Clarendon; *State Papers*, i. 25; Pepys, June 7, 1662 (ii. 252); June 2, October 12, 1663 (iii. 151-5, 299, 300); vi. 5; vii. 325, note; Grey's *Debates*, iii. 397-8. Pepys, June 6, 1660, is ambiguous; but in vol. iii. 345 (November 16, 1663) he asserts his belief in Coventry's innocence.

<sup>5</sup> Pepys, June, July, 1666 (v. 304-84).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* June 11 (v. 321).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* June 24 (v. 341); July 18 (v. 367); October 28 (vi. 40).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* December 16 (vi. 103-4), June 2 (vi. 400).

<sup>9</sup> June 27 (v. 345).



16<sup>88</sup> of every English gentleman's education;<sup>1</sup> while to the vexed question of naval commissions he devoted a pamphlet,<sup>2</sup> which appeared indeed about a year before his death, but which may have been evoked<sup>3</sup> by the circumstances of the Chatham disaster.<sup>4</sup> His solution of the point at issue was characteristic in the extreme; for, while he considered it advisable from a political standpoint that neither 'tarpaulins' nor gentlemen should monopolise command, he maintained—first, that no gentleman ought to obtain a commission until thoroughly competent; and, secondly, that a gentleman so qualified would necessarily possess an advantage over the mere seaman.

The progress of the Dutch war and its inevitable result, the increased importance accruing to our foreign relations, must have given, moreover, an early impetus to that strong interest in Continental affairs so characteristic of Savile's later career. His connection with Coventry, to whom these questions had become of such personal moment, tended to accentuate his sympathies, which were, perhaps, still further enhanced by an intimacy with Mr. William Temple, an accomplished Irishman some years his senior, who owed to the crisis his first diplomatic mission as secret envoy to the Bishop of Munster. At the conclusion of the task Temple received the post of Resident at the Court of Brussels; and some three months later (January, 16<sup>88</sup>) France, under her young and ambitious monarch Louis XIV., suddenly coalesced with the Dutch. To these events we are indebted for the following letters, the first of Sir George Savile's which have been yet recovered:—

*Sir George Savile to Mr. Temple.*<sup>5</sup>

Feb. 5 s.x. 1666.

Sir,—It is a Sin against the Publick, and a Trespass upon you, at this time to clog you with such an idle Correspondence

<sup>1</sup> See introduction to the *Rough Draught in Works*.

<sup>2</sup> The *Rough Draught*.

<sup>3</sup> See introduction to the *Rough Draught in Works*.

<sup>4</sup> The author describes himself as beyond the pale of Parliament. But Savile became a member of the Upper House early in 1668. Among the *Spencer MSS.* (31 (11)) is a letter from a Mr. Henry or Hervey dated July 1667, which specially asks Savile, if he have any expedients ready framed, to go up to town and communicate them. Savile remained in the country some time afterwards, and perhaps composed the *Rough Draught* in its original form as a response to his friend's appeal. (See introduction to Tract.)

<sup>5</sup> They had probably met either through William Coventry, the Sidneys, or the Packingtons, with all of whom Temple was acquainted. (See *Temple's Letters, passim*; *Life*, by Courtenay, i. 26, 31.)

<sup>6</sup> *Temple's Letters*, edit. 1700, i. 419.

as mine : But I find I consider my own Interest before yours ; 1666  
being not able to make you an Expression of my Kindness at  
so dear a rate as the denying my self the Satisfaction of hearing  
from you. And therefore I take hold of your Offer, and beg  
you would sometimes bestow a Letter upon me ; which shall  
be as welcome for telling me you are well, as it can be for the  
best News it bringeth in relation to the Publick : For which,  
if I can be concerned next to what I am for my best Friends,  
it is the utmost I will pretend to in that Matter. I find his  
Majesty of *France* will be an angry Enemy. He doth not  
declare War, like an *honnête homme* ;<sup>1</sup> and therefore I hope he  
will not pursue it like a *wise one*.

I do not despair, but that the *English* who use to go into  
*France* for their Breeding, may have the Honor once to teach  
*Them* better Manners. The League with *Spain*<sup>2</sup> is a good  
Circumstance to make us able to do it : It is so seasonably, and  
so well done, that I will suppose you had a Hand in it. In  
the mean time we have great Alarms the *Monsieur* will invade  
us, which makes everybody prepare for their Entertainment.  
And I hope they will neither find us so little ready, or so  
divided, as perhaps they expect.

I will not make this longer, when I have assured you I am,<sup>3</sup>

Sir,

Your most Faithful Humble Servant,

GEORGE SAVILE.<sup>4</sup>

*Sir George Savile to Sir William Temple.*<sup>5</sup>

April 4. 1666.

Sir, - This must carry my Thanks to you for two Letters<sup>6</sup>  
I receiv'd at the same time from you ; which giveth me a fair  
Occasion to say a great deal to you ; but that I will not trespass  
upon our Agreement, to omit Ceremony, or anything that  
looketh like it. Yet you must give me leave to tell you, I  
think myself as much assured of your Kindness, by your  
letting me stay in your Thoughts (when you might forget me  
without Breach of Friendship, considering the Weight of  
Business that lieth upon you) as I could be by any Mark of it  
you can imagine. And if you will suppose my Sense of it  
answerably, and reckon upon my Service accordingly ; if it  
may ever be of use to you, you will do me but Right. In the  
mean time you make me sensible of the Inconvenience of  
living out of the World : Now that I find it impossible for me  
to write three Lines of Sense in Exchange for your Letters,  
that are full of everything which can make them welcome. I

<sup>1</sup> *Temple's Letters*, edit. 1700, i. 35.

<sup>2</sup> This seems to have been a false report (*ibid.* i. 31).

<sup>3</sup> This, the first letter of Sir George Savile which we have recovered, was  
brought to our notice by a passage in Miss Cartwright's *Madame*, p. 235.

<sup>4</sup> 'Savill' in the printed copy, but he never wrote it thus.

<sup>5</sup> *Letters* (1700), i. 424. Temple had just been created a Baronet in  
requital of a special diplomatic service.

<sup>6</sup> Not extant.

1666 am so aſham'd you ſhould conſe with a dead Man, that I almoſt wiſh the *French* landed upon our Coaſt, thinking it better to write you a ſad Story than none. How ſoon I may be furniſhed with ſomething of this kind, dependeth upon our Succeſs at Sea, and the Faith of your Biſhop,<sup>1</sup> which may well be ſhaken, if you do not ſupport it with your Bills of Exchange.<sup>2</sup> He is likely to be ſo over-match'd this next Campagne, that I doubt<sup>3</sup> he will be tempted to break Faith with Hereticks, rather than be a Martyr in our Calendar.<sup>4</sup> I ſhould be glad to hear *Spain* would come into our Scales, to help us to weigh down our Enemies; But I fear their ill Luck in the late War, hath not left them Spirit enough to fall out with the *French*, though their Inter-eſt provoketh them to it. Beſides the Crown is in a Cradle; And a *Spaniſh* Council I imagine to be as ſlow an Aſſembly as a Houſe of Commons. So that we muſt rely upon the Oak and Courage of *England* to do our Buſineſs, there being ſmall Appearance of anything to help us from abroad.

I believe before this cometh to your Hands, you will be waiting upon *Mademoiſelle Beverwaert*,<sup>5</sup> who is a Teſtimony that this War hath given us no ſuch Antipathy to the *Dutch*, ſince we chuſe one to breed Statesmen for the next Age. The Captain that went upon ſo peaceable an Errand, and into a Friend's Harbour, had ill Fortune to be ſo roughly ſaluted:<sup>6</sup> But it being a ſingle Act of the Officer, without any Order from his Superiors, it is of no more Conſequence to us than the Sound of it may amount to.

I direct this as you bid me; and tho' it ſhould not come to you, I aſſure myſelf you would not impute it to the Omiſſion, but to the ill Fortune of

Sir,

Your moſt Faithful Humble Servant,  
GEORGE SAVILE.<sup>7</sup>

By June<sup>\*</sup> the rumours of a French or Dutch invasion, to which Savile refers, had become ſo importunate that the Government<sup>8</sup> hurriedly iſſued commiſſions<sup>10</sup> to perſons of conſideration, empowering each of them to raiſe a troop

<sup>1</sup> Of Munſter, with whom Temple had concluded a treaty. He proved treacherous.

<sup>2</sup> There had been difficulties about transmitting the ſubſidy promiſed to the biſhop.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. I fear.

<sup>4</sup> The news of his defection evidently had not reached England.

<sup>5</sup> Siſter-in-law of Lord Oſſory, and on the point of marriage with Lord Arlington. The Beverwaerts were connected with the Houſe of Orange.

<sup>6</sup> See *Temple's Letters* (1700), i. 48.

<sup>7</sup> Concerning ſignature, ſee *ante*. A letter from Temple to Sir George, dated December 9, 1667, containing foreign news, will be found in *Letters* (1700), i. 129.

<sup>8</sup> Pepys, June 29, 1666, v. 346.

<sup>9</sup> Which, be it remembered, had no land forces at its diſpoſition ſave the Guards, the Militia, and a few gariſon companies.

<sup>10</sup> *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* 1665-66, p. 475, June 30.

of eighty horse, which troops were to be subsequently 1666 incorporated as regiments. Of these commissions, one was directed to Sir George; and Sir Philip Monckton, an eminent Yorkshire loyalist,<sup>1</sup> became his lieutenant. These circumstances interpret the following letter:—

*For my honoured friend sir Philip Monckton.*<sup>2</sup>

Pontefract, July 5.

Dear sir, I desired my 1<sup>d</sup> duke<sup>3</sup> to propose that to you, for which I wanted confidence, believing the imployment your friendship maketh you willing to accept, not good enough for you; but I can assure you, if I had a better in my power to offer you, you are the man in the world I should most wish to serve with, and not only out of kindness to you, but as nobody is abler to do the king service, if there should be occasion to use officers as well as to list them. I do intend, if no thing happen to divert me from it, to bee tomorrow night at Yorke, where I shall be glad to meet you then or the next day. In the mean time I hope you will be picking up men that are tolerably horsed, which I find will bee the greatest difficulty. Anthony Eyre is cornette, and is doing what he can to list men in Nottinghamshire. Clifton Leeke I think will bee quartermaster. For corporals I have pitched upon two, and leave the other for you to chuse. I hope my lady will forgive me for taking you from her, and pray do you believe not one in the world is more

Your faithful friend and servant,

GEO. SAVILE.

My 1<sup>d</sup> duke sayth he will furnish me with pistols and holsters.

A day later Sir George was at York,<sup>4</sup> where he remained in command of his troop about two months.<sup>5</sup> We find him corresponding with his brother on the purchase of martial equipment, and observe with much amusement the good-natured spendthrift's determination that his brother, proverbially indifferent to dress, shall be 'modish' for once. 'A handsome belt' he records with malicious satisfaction, 'will cost eight pounds, and if you have a sword for six more you are a happy man.'<sup>6</sup>

The second Yorkshire troop, under the Duke of Buckingham, was also quartered at York, and their sojourn there probably increased the intimacy between the two captains. We find Sir George engaged as second to

<sup>1</sup> Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, ii. 418.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 419, from Galway papers.

<sup>3</sup> Buckingham (?).

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 7, p. 124: account of his expenditure during journey, &c. (*Rufford MSS.*).

<sup>5</sup> Because privateers had been seen off Humber mouth (*Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* 1665-66, p. 546, July 17).

<sup>6</sup> Letter from Henry Savile to his brother (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 8).

1666 Buckingham in a dispute with Lord Fauconberg.<sup>1</sup> In the Minster, says Sir John Reresby (a cornet in the Duke's troop), 'came Sir George Savile by, and desired me to provide him a longer sword, his being too short, by which I found the challenge was accepted.' On the ground Fauconberg and both seconds drew, but the duke's heart failed, and he accepted a superficial apology. At York, too, began the guilty intimacy between Buckingham and the Countess of Shrewsbury, which led to so tragic a scandal.

The scare of invasion soon passed, and by September 29 Sir George Savile's troop was disbanded.<sup>2</sup> His brother had rallied him<sup>3</sup> with his usual liveliness on his approaching descent 'from a great captain' to a 'country Knight.' A week later, however, in letters of which the tone is light and reckless, with an undercurrent of bitterness, Harry Savile abruptly intimates that he has volunteered for the fleet, in the avowed hope of meeting his death.<sup>4</sup> The cause of this sudden and entirely transient despondency does not appear; he reserved it even from his brother; as we learn through a second epistle forwarded from the fleet, which expresses the most sincere and passionate gratitude for the affectionate solicitude of Sir George.<sup>5</sup>

Although the danger of an actual descent seemed for the moment at an end, a general sense of uneasiness pervaded all classes, and the universal conviction that the conduct of the war had been in the highest degree unsatisfactory now reached the point when utterance becomes a necessity. Parliament had met September 21, and the country gentlemen, as contrasted with the dependents of the Crown, had come up in no good humour. They began to regard themselves, and to be regarded by others, as a body whose interests were opposed to that of the Court.<sup>6</sup> The waste of public money, the ill success of the war, touched them both in pride and in purse, while the profligacy of Whitehall stirred into sullen discontent a remaining leaven of Puritan sentiment. This 'Faction,' as it was called, acted in alliance (an informal alliance, it is true) with the Lords of the old 'Presbyterian'<sup>7</sup> party in the Upper House.

<sup>1</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, 1875, pp. 66-69.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* 1666-67, p. 167, September 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, August 2, p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> Pepye, October 21, November 5, 1666 (Wheatley's edition, vi. 33, 51).

<sup>7</sup> 'Presbyterian' in the later seventeenth century was the term applied, much as Puritan had been at an earlier time, (1) to those members of the Established Church who were opposed to the 'High Church' tenets and

Upon Clarendon as the ostensible Minister there concentrated the animosity of these 'Mutineers;' and they were reinforced therefore, and in a manner directed, by his Grace of Buckingham. 16<sup>66</sup><sub>67</sub>

It is impossible to credit the Duke with motives more exalted than hatred for the Chancellor, resentment against Charles, and the fitful ambition which occasionally animated his really remarkable abilities. But it is certain that his patriotic professions, his 'quality and condescension,' and his fascinating manners, deceived many grave men into a belief that 'the loose life he led . . . the vanities and levities' of his character being 'wrought off by age,' he would develop the highest qualities of a statesman.<sup>1</sup>

Encouraged by such powerful patronage, the country gentlemen did not spare their censures.<sup>2</sup> The Government easily recognised the David of the new political Adullam;<sup>3</sup> and scarcely had the session closed, upon much ill feeling, ere the vengeance of the Court overtook the most prominent offender. On February 25, 16<sup>66</sup><sub>67</sub>,<sup>4</sup> the Duke, on a charge of treasonable conspiracy with an astrologer, was summarily dismissed from all his offices, and a warrant issued, February 27, for his arrest. Tower Hill loomed before his imagination, and he absconded for a period of four months. In the Yorkshire Lieutenantcy, as in his other offices, he was superseded; Sir George Savile and Sir Thomas Osborne resigned in consequence the commissions they had held under him, and thus stood definitely committed to the anti-Clarendon party, the party of discontent.<sup>5</sup>

favoured a modified Episcopacy (Ashley, Holles, Manchester, Wharton, Say and Sele, &c., all conformed); (2) to those Nonconformists who, like Baxter, though not unfavourable to a modified Episcopacy, were excluded from the Established Church by scruples as to ritual; (3) to the small minority which regarded the Presbyterian model as of Divine institution (Baxter, *Reliquæ*, ii. 278).

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon, iii. 133-4.

<sup>2</sup> See the determined attempts to secure, by the appointment of a joint Parliamentary committee, a detailed inquiry into the naval accounts, which revealed startling discrepancies. (Pepys himself, September 23, October 10, 1666, estimates receipts during the war at 5,590,000*l.*, expenditure at 3,200,000*l.*, of which nearly 1,000,000*l.* still remained unpaid; and pertinently asks what had become of the remainder.) The attempt had been forestalled and frustrated by the appointment of a Royal Commission, which, though constituted on popular lines, was not acceptable. (See also Carte, iv. 265; Kennet, iii. 264.)

<sup>3</sup> See Pepys, February 27, 16<sup>66</sup><sub>67</sub>; Carte's *Ormonde*; Clarendon, *passim*; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, pp. 44-46.

<sup>4</sup> On the charge of holding secret correspondences to raise mutinies among the troops, seditions among the people, and other traitorous designs and practices (Kennet, iii. 263).

<sup>5</sup> The failure of Sir George Savile to secure the Comptrollership of the

1666-67

The Court, however, saw the necessity of some conciliatory measures, and upon a vacancy of the Treasury the duties of that post were assigned to a very capable board, on which Sir William Coventry<sup>1</sup> and his brother-in-law Ashley—both of whom were as well reputed for ability as for an antagonism more or less defined towards Clarendon—held seats.<sup>2</sup> The new Commission was decidedly popular, and buckled with a will to the gigantic task of financial reorganisation; but it was too late.<sup>3</sup> Crippled by enormous debts, his country exhausted, his sailors mutinous for want of pay, Charles saw the necessity of peace. Negotiations commenced at Breda, and in expectation of a satisfactory issue the English Government resolved upon economical grounds against commissioning the fleet.

The responsibility for this fatal step is angrily debated; in all probability it was a counsel of necessity which none approved, but in which all were forced to concur.<sup>4</sup> Of the error meanwhile De Witt took immediate advantage. By June 3 the Dutch fleet swept the Channel; by the 7th it was before Harwich; on the 10th it had reached the Nore, and that night Sheerness was taken. Coventry and Pepys worked manfully, despatching fireships and effecting all that the emergency permitted, but to little result. The retribution which had so terribly fallen on a shiftless and corrupt Administration, the confusion, the insubordination, the terror of that appalling conjuncture are vividly painted in the graphic pages of Pepys.<sup>5</sup>

It would appear that Sir George went down to the scene of action, probably as a volunteer in the 'General's' train, and that he was at first inclined to minimise the danger. 'I hope in God' wrote his friend Lord Ogle, June 13,<sup>6</sup> 'this will meete you at your House and ye Allarme

Household on the death of Sir Hugh Pollard, in November 1666, can hardly be ascribed to his political associations, since Clifford, the successful candidate, was also an anti-Clarendonian.—Evelyn, November 27; Pepys, November 29; Lady Windsor to H. Savile, December 26, 1666 (British Museum, Add. MSS. 28,569).

<sup>1</sup> He had recently in despair thrown up the Commissionership of the Navy, and poor Pepys bewailed his defection in pathetic fashion. (December 16, 1666; January 9, 16, 16<sup>66</sup>/<sub>7</sub>; April 3, 4, 10, 1667; vi. 103, 126, 132, 251, 256, 267.)

<sup>2</sup> Pepys, May 22, 31; June 3; July 22; August 9, 20, 23, 1667 (Wheatley's edition, vi. 331, 344, 349; vii. 31, 60, 73, 79).

<sup>3</sup> See Coventry's assertion to this effect, December 27, 1667; Pepys, vii. 249; and Pepys himself, *ibid.* p. 259.

<sup>4</sup> See Evelyn; *James II.*; Clarendon; Pepys.

<sup>5</sup> The seamen were mutinying for pay all through the crisis, and many who had deserted were *serving on board the invader's fleet* (Pepys, June 14).

<sup>6</sup> Addressed, 'For the Honorable Sr George Savill Barronett These at his House in Lincoln's Inn Fields London' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [34]).

over. I shall not wish for a Judgment of it since I have had from you, and rest satisfied it will only be a little bragg of ye Dutch.' 1667

The crowning disaster, however, still impended, and Sir George was himself present when, on June 13, the Dutch, having broken the boom at Chatham, fired the vessels there. 'A Parliament' was the cry throughout the country, and the urgency of Sir George on this point seems to have been specially remarkable.<sup>1</sup> The Government once more appealed to the patriotism of volunteers;<sup>2</sup> and Savile, whose own commission of the preceding year was renewed, wrote as follows<sup>3</sup> to Sir Philip Monckton:—

*For my honoured friend S<sup>r</sup> Philip Monckton, at Newbold. To be left with the postmaster at Howden, Yorkshire, p<sup>d</sup> 3<sup>d</sup>.*

London, 13 June.

Dear Sir, I do not doubt but you will hear the confusion wee are in here since the burning of our ships by the Dutch at Chatham. I was a melancholy spectator of that businesse, so that I could tell you the particulars, if it was not so unpleasant to me to repeat them, as it would be to you to read them. It is feared they may attempt the firing of the ships wee have left upon the river, and the possibility they being masters of the sea may suddenly invade us, maketh the king resolve to raise a great many horse, and hath made me a captaine againe, which though I should have avoided at another time,<sup>1</sup> yet in this exigency I lay aside all other considerations, as I believe you will do; and therefore I desire you would speak to my two corporalls if they please to be so againe, and to those that you brought in before, that they will be ready at Pontefract within a fortnight, in which time you shall know the precise day of the rendezvous and where wee are to have armes, if we should be invaded, and that wee are engaged in a formed warre. I do not doubt but you will have better imployments, and so will Th<sup>o</sup> Escott, and S<sup>r</sup> C<sup>r</sup> Bethell, but your having been so kind to mee as not onley to let mee bee your Captain once, but to promise mee you would allow mee to bee so againe, I do without scruple propose it to you. I am in such haste that I have not time to write to Th<sup>o</sup> Escot nor S<sup>r</sup> C<sup>r</sup> Bethell, and therefore I desire that you will excuse mee to them, and acquaint my cozen Fox with it, that if he pleaseth hee may have the same imployment hee had last summer. Pray send mee one letter to Rufford, and another to London, that I may be sure

<sup>1</sup> Newsletter of June 15 (*Cal. St. Pap. Dom.* 1667, p. 188, June 15).

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. St. Pap.* 1667, pp. 175, 182, 183.

<sup>3</sup> Printed in Hunter's *South Yorkshire*, ii. 419; from Lord Galway's collection.

<sup>1</sup> Probably an allusion to the disgrace of Buckingham.



1667 I know your resolution, in case I should remove suddenly from hence, which is probable.

I am, dear sir,

Your faithful humble servant,

GEO. SAVILE.

A few days later Sir George hastened North, as is shown by the following letter : <sup>1</sup>

*For my honoured friend S<sup>r</sup> Philip Monckton, at Newbold. To be left with the postmaster at Howden, Yorkshire.*

Rufford, June 19, 67.

S<sup>r</sup>,—Your accepting an employment once more, so little worthy of you, is no surprisall to me, because you have so used mee to your kindnesse as to make mee expect it. I assure you it is not quite lost upon mee, for I value it as it deserveth, and do look upon myselfe as your eternall debtor for it. I cannot enough commend your zeale for your country. I wish those that have brought us to this condition would yet take such measures as might help us out of it. If you and I do our partes in our little sphere, it will be a satisfaction to us, though it should not preserve us. I hear nothing since I came down, so that I conclude the enemy hath attempted nothing upon the Thames. Whether wee shall be invaded or no, seemeth to bee in the power of the French and Dutch, now that they have taken the sea from us ; it is good to provide against the worst, and as to my troop, I have appointed next Wednesday, the time to meet mee at Pontefract, so that I desire you would take care it may be known by the corporalls and those that are near you. I intend to be there Tuesday night, and shall be glad to find you there.

I am, dear sir,

Your faithful humble servant,

GEO. SAVILE.

During the absence of Sir George in Yorkshire his brother kept him well supplied with intelligence.<sup>2</sup> ‘Tis said,’ writes Henry, June 20, ‘that nobody in the councill was against calling a parliament, but the Duke,<sup>3</sup> my Lord Chancellor, and Sir George Cartwright [:] the rest unanimously, and our friend ‘violently, for calling it presently ;’ however, the power of the others has so far prevailed.’

The Exchequer, however, could not furnish pay for the forces, and a week later Parliament was summoned for

<sup>1</sup> Hunter, *South Yorkshire*, ii. 419; Galway papers.

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 15 18. ‘Your wife and little chits,’ he writes, June 18, ‘went away yesterday in fine cool weather for their journey’ (p. 16)

<sup>3</sup> Of York.

<sup>1</sup> Coventry (?).

<sup>1</sup> In the old sense *immediately*.

the 25th of the ensuing July. Scarcely had the proclamation issued, ere Buckingham created a fresh excitement 1667 by surrendering, four months after date, to the warrant against him. Upon these events Sir William Coventry dilates in the following very interesting letter to Sir George, the earliest which has been preserved :—<sup>1</sup>

July 2<sup>d</sup> (67)

Dear Sir George,—I have y<sup>rs</sup> of 29th June,<sup>2</sup> and have acquainted my L<sup>d</sup> General<sup>3</sup> with the readiness of y<sup>r</sup> Troop and have sent y<sup>r</sup> letter to y<sup>r</sup> Brother

The hundred pounds was not intended over and above the pay, but was sent to bee ready to discharge quarters in case of (need<sup>4</sup> ?) that soe they might not bee upon free quarter, or the suspicion of it.

The Commission for 80 is justification for 40, but w<sup>th</sup> out a Commission hanging men is not a good trade for a man of 10,000/ (?) per annum whatever it may be an Irish estate or noe estate ; y<sup>r</sup> commission is good soe as you exceed not y<sup>r</sup> number.

Yesterday L<sup>d</sup> Arlington, Mr. Comptroller Secretary Morrice and my selfe were sent to examine the D. of Buckingham the principal question related to Heydon,<sup>5</sup> whose acquaintance hee tells us hee first acquired in y<sup>r</sup> Company at Mr. Digby's but this need not allarme you, as reflecting upon you, for it was not said with any other reflection than that you joynd together to laugh at Heyden, & (with ?) him all Rosicrucians,

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 25.

<sup>2</sup> No letter from Halifax to Coventry appears to be extant. We may conjecture that after Sir William's death Lord Halifax recovered and destroyed his own letters.

<sup>3</sup> The Lord General, or Commander-in-Chief, Monk, Duke of Albemarle.

<sup>4</sup> Word illegible.

<sup>5</sup> Probably alluding to the Duke of Ormonde's suppression of mutiny during the preceding year ; nine men were hanged under martial law (Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 253 ; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 13). It ranked among the charges in an abortive impeachment drawn against Ormonde, October of this year (Carte, iv. 312–14, 382).

<sup>6</sup> 'Just before the recess of the parliament, one Dr. John Heydon was taken up for treasonable practices in sowing sedition in the navy & engaging persons in a conspiracy to seize the Tower.' (He had been imprisoned and had lost much reputation in consequence of a futile attempt to foretell the end of Cromwell.) ' . . . This insignificant rascal was mighty great with the Duke of Buckingham, who, notwithstanding the vanity of the art, & the notorious ignorance of the professor of it, made him cast not only his own but the King's nativity ; a matter . . . condemned by . . . statute . . . Heydon pretended to have been in all the Duke's secrets for near four years past, & that he had been all that time designing against the King and his Government,' &c. (Carte, iv. 293). As regards Heydon himself, there is independent information. Granger's *Biographical History of England* (vol. iv. p. 108) describes three prints of him, and says he had no right to the title of *Eques*. 'John Heydon,' continues the article, 'who sometimes assumed the name of Eugenius Theodidactus, was a great pretender to skill in the Rosicrucian philosophy and the celestial sciences. There is something truly original in his books, and he appears to have far out-canted all the rest of his

1667 of which Heydon pretends to bee one. Soe much for that matter, in y<sup>r</sup> other concerns I have not bin<sup>t</sup> wholly idle, but cannot give you the account of it at this distance only I have reason to beleive that his R.H. is still favourable to you, I wish I could discourse halfe an hour with you but that cannot bee, nor is it worth a journey (which I say that you may not mistake me) when it is you shall have notice.

The enemy is gone downe to the Gun fleet, when they will come up againe is in their power and pleasure and not in ours.

There is an opinion that the peace will soone bee concluded, I wish it, and thinke it possible, but dare not bee very confident of it.

My humble service to the Ladies (&c)

The Duke of Buckingham eventually succeeded, without great difficulty, in clearing himself of the charge; by July 17 he was released, with much-enhanced popularity; and three days later Sir George Savile wrote as follows to Sir Thomas Osborne, one of the Duke's Yorkshire adherents. It is evident that the writer was still at Rufford: <sup>1</sup>

*For the Hon<sup>ble</sup> S<sup>r</sup> T<sup>m</sup> Osborne Banneret at Keeton.*<sup>2</sup>

July 20 67 <sup>3</sup>

S<sup>r</sup>,—I am ever disappointed in my intentions to wait upon you, which I would not omitt, if the coming to you now would not be a greater rudenesse, then staying away, the meeles being emongst my children, which maketh me conclude I must

brethren. His chymical & astrological works are numerous.' Many of these are in the British Museum, and the mystical account of some Rosicrucian Utopia in the preface to the *Holy Guide* is rather fine. Heydon never himself assumes the title of Doctor, given him in the Museum Catalogue, but would appear to have been a lawyer. The dates of his books range from 1655 to 1665. The dedication to one of them (1665) is directed to Prince Rupert ('our acquaintance began with Mercury at Glover's Hall')

Rupert's scientific tastes are well known while a notice of the author by a friend, expressly mentioning the patronage of Buckingham, is dated March 16<sup>th</sup> 3. The term 'Rosicrucian' as the name of a sect of hermetic philosophers has been successively derived from the name of the supposed founder, from the arms of Luther (a rose and a cross), and from *ros* (dew) and ✕, the mystical symbol of light. It first occurs in a work dated 1614, which is now usually regarded as an elaborate piece of mystification. The treatise was, however, very seriously received, and its doctrines were widely adopted. The Rosicrucians seem to have been the Theosophists of the seventeenth century. In religion they are believed to have been mystic; they were great professors of alchemy and astrology, and taught the existence of spiritual beings intermediate between the hosts of heaven and hell. (See *Rape of the Lock*; *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*, 1783; and *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th edit.) A curious rhapsody on Rosicrucianism by H. Jennings, which reached a third edition in 1887, seems to be the most recent work on the subject; it does not pretend to be critical.

<sup>1</sup> A letter addressed to him at Rufford, July 18, 1667, is among the *Spencer MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> Kiveton.

<sup>3</sup> British Museum, Add. MSS. 28,053, f. 5.

bee an unwelcome guest and a dangerous one, where there are so many little ones, besides the particular concern I am to have for my Goddaughters pretty face, which I would not have spoyled though but for a week. The letters this post speak more doubtfully of a peace, so that I presume the parliament must certainly meet my Ld. of Buckingham hath kissed the K's hand.<sup>1</sup> 1667

I am Sr your most faithfull humble servant

GEO. SAVILE

Parliament met, in effect, five days later; but was prorogued on the signature of peace, after a four days' session.<sup>2</sup> The members naturally resented the useless inconvenience to which they had been subjected. The next session, it was felt, must be stormy; some propitiatory sacrifice was required; and Clarendon was designated on all hands, with startling unanimity, as the appropriate victim.

By August 27 H. Savile was writing as follows to his brother:—<sup>3</sup>

I had intended you a letter by the carrier,<sup>4</sup> but, nobody coming for it, it was not sent, but burnt, though there was nothing in it but what now may be very well trusted with the post, which is the persecution of my Lord Chancellour, who is not yet sure of keeping his scales, though he desires them only till the Parliament sits, before whom he will stand in his justification against all articles that shall be brought against him. This storm is wholly raised by our friend,<sup>5</sup> and wholly opposed with the greatest violence imaginable by my master,<sup>6</sup> which has caused a great deal of anger there. . . . This will positively answer your question as to the sitting of the Parliament. . . . The Duke of Buckingham is yet in town, and very far from having any correspondence with the Chancellour as you heard. I rather think him engaged where we wish him.

Four days after the date of this letter Lord Clarendon, at the command of Charles, resigned the Great Seal;<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Your letter to my Lord of Buckingham was also deliver'd' (wrote Harry Savile to his brother, July 22); 'he is extreemly your servant' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 18).

<sup>2</sup> See the vote for the disbanding of the new army, Coventry's response that it was already in contemplation, and, in the prorogation speech, the King's contemptuous reference to the report that he intended to govern by a standing army: such troops, he said, had only been raised both years temporarily and in the last resort, and the officers now in commission were only too anxious to lay down their arms (*Parliamentary History*).

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. by a private hand, a method of communication less liable than the post to official investigation.

<sup>5</sup> Evidently Coventry, though Cooper suggests Buckingham.

<sup>6</sup> The Duke of York.

<sup>7</sup> Pepys, vii. 80, August 31. (See also August 26, 27, 29.)

1667 and within forty-eight hours of this startling revolution Sir William Coventry announced<sup>1</sup> his own intention of quitting the Duke's service, thus finally severing his connection with the Navy. This decision during the ensuing day he communicated to his nephew, Sir George: —

*Sir William Coventry to Sir George Savile.*<sup>2</sup>

Sept 3 (67)

Dear S<sup>r</sup> George Since my last to you to Althorpe enclosed to my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland, I am yett at liberty to tell you another part of that which made mee formerly desire you to suspend your judgement, it is my leaving his R.H. service, to doe w<sup>ch</sup> having asked his leave some weekes since, hee<sup>6</sup> (w<sup>th</sup> great kindnesse) at first suspended his Resolution, and at last granted my desire, but under strict obligation not to speake of it to any, his reason being to prevent importunity untill he had resolved who should succeed mee. This past befor anything of my L<sup>d</sup> Chancellor's businesse broke forthe,<sup>3</sup> but that having since made soe much noise and Mr Brounkard having bin turned away<sup>4</sup> whoe did (lesse<sup>5</sup> ?) in it then myselfe, it is naturall enough for the world to beleve that I have bin soe too, but I assure you this is the truth, and that I beleve all my L<sup>d</sup> Chancellor's power w<sup>th</sup> all the present circumstances to my disadvantage w<sup>th</sup> his R.H. could not have done that;<sup>6</sup> but if it could, in the case the King's affairs were, I must have hazarded that alsoe, or bin wanting to my duty.

The person designed for my successor is Mr Wren<sup>7</sup> to whom in a day or two I shall surrender,<sup>8</sup> amongst other conveniences of this retreat too long for a letter, one will bee that I shall bee more able to enjoy myselfe and my friends having now noe other attachment to the Court then that of the Councell, and Commission of the Treasury each of which having plenty of others to attend may sometimes admitt of my absence. I shall not need to tell you that my Lord Bridgeman hath the scales, and that soe farre as I can observe it gives very generall satisfaction to all people that they are put into his hands.<sup>9</sup> The King is very free in declaring his dissatisfaction to my L<sup>d</sup> Chancellor to have bin long; amongst other reasons w<sup>ch</sup> hee gives to many people, one is, that my L<sup>d</sup> Chancellor tooke soe much upon him that it tooke away the Liberty of debate in the

<sup>1</sup> Pepys, September 2, vii. 92, &c

<sup>2</sup> *Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 25.

<sup>3</sup> Pepys, September 2, vii. 92; September 8, vii. 101; Clarendon, iii. 292; the differences of interpretation are interesting.

<sup>4</sup> Pepys, vii. 94.

<sup>5</sup> Word illegible.

<sup>6</sup> Pepys, vii. 101.

<sup>7</sup> Matthew Wren, the Chancellor's Secretary, author of an answer to *Occana*. (See Pepys, September 2 and 23, vii. 92, 122; Clarendon, iii. 292-3.)

<sup>8</sup> He did so on the 4th (Pepys, vii. 97).

<sup>9</sup> Pepys applauds the appointment. He was an accomplished lawyer, but proved weak.

Councell; <sup>1</sup> but the King saith his tendernesse toward his R.H. 1667  
made him endure it thus long.

Your brother seemes doubtfull of going to Althorpe

I am for ever

Yours.<sup>2</sup>

*Henry Savile to Sir George.*<sup>3</sup>

London Sept. 5, '67.

(He is unable to pay an intended visit to the Sunderlands at Althorpe.)

My absence would be otherwise look'd upon now than at another time, and construed as some dissatisfaction either of my uncle's concern or my own . . . all that is here worth your knowledge you will either have learnt from the letter Sir William writ to you on Tuesday, which he shew'd me, or from the discourse you may have from H. Sydney, whom I entrusted with all you can know of me. Our friend<sup>4</sup> has the greatest mind in the world to have you in town, though he has no present argument to invite you hither. If you look upon his last letter, at the bottom of it, there is a blott, which was the beginning of a sentence to draw you hither. I am so much perswaded that it were of use to you to shew yourself at present that I could wish it most heartily. He has this morning bought a house of Sir Thomas Clarges for fourteen hundred pounds; 'tis one of those four pretty handsome ones in Pall Mall by my Lady Ranelagh's. . . . My Lord of Buckingham has made but few visits to court since he came out of his troubles, but was yesterday two hours alone with the King in his closet, which esclaireissement I hope will be to his advantage. I have not seen him since myself.

In effect, the disgrace of Clarendon naturally transferred power into the hands of those who had most contributed to his downfall, and who certainly, in this respect, represented popular sympathies. On September 15 Buckingham was restored to all his offices; while to him and to William Coventry a Ministerial predominance naturally accrued.<sup>5</sup> Both men were particularly concerned

<sup>1</sup> See also Pepys, September 2, 8 (vii. 93, 101-4); and the letters of Charles to Ormonde, September 15, 1667 (Ellis, *Original Letters*, series 2, vol. iv. p. 39).

<sup>2</sup> No signature. <sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 20. <sup>4</sup> Sir William (?).

<sup>5</sup> The fall of the Chancellor was unacceptable to some of Savile's friends, as Lord Ogle. (See *Spencer MSS.* 31 [34].) The same letter (dated September 20) contains the curious passage: 'I wonder as you doe at ye name of ye Duke's sonn Edgar Atheling had right to a Crowne, but never possess it.' Prince Edgar, the Duke's fourth and at this time only living son, born September 16, soon followed his brothers, June 8, 1671. (See Pepys, September 16, 1667, vii. 114.)

<sup>6</sup> 'I hard my L<sup>d</sup> Duke of Buckingham hath all his places. . . w<sup>h</sup> I am glad of, he will be active now. I heare noe thing of our frend S<sup>r</sup> Thomas Osbourne, I believe he will be a great Man in business and I wish Sir Will. Hickman soe too' (Lord Ogle, as above).

1667 for the interests of George Savile, the Duke being, as Henry informed his brother,<sup>1</sup> as much the baronet's friend 'as 'tis possible for a man to be.' 'He gave,' adds the writer, 'a testimony of it by speaking to the King the other day about your business,<sup>2</sup> and how seasonable a time this is to do it in. Your other friend<sup>3</sup> is as forward as he, and if you were here yourself I do positively think it would be done' before the meeting of Parliament.<sup>4</sup>

The opening of the session, however, found Sir George still a stranger to Parliamentary life; and it was not till three months later that he obtained, under rather curious circumstances, the honour he so much desired. In his opening speech the Keeper had expressed the King's intention of acceding to a demand, strongly urged during the session of 1665-66, for a Parliamentary inquiry into the question of naval expenditure.<sup>5</sup> A Bill for taking the accounts of public money was introduced October 26; and by December 3 it was resolved that no member of Parliament should sit on the Commission.<sup>7</sup> The Bill reached the Upper House December 18. It was strongly supported by Buckingham; violently opposed by Anglesey, Treasurer of the Navy, and Ashley, Treasurer of Prizes.<sup>8</sup> On December 19 it received the Royal Assent,<sup>9</sup> and an adjournment immediately followed. Of the Commissioners appointed, the greater part are unknown to fame;<sup>10</sup> the name of Sir George Savile is conspicuous on the list: and

<sup>1</sup> September 17, *Savile Correspondence*, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> The peerage.

<sup>3</sup> Sir William (?).

<sup>4</sup> 'Before the tenth of October,' as Savile himself expresses it.

<sup>5</sup> The King's Commission of Accounts had proved a complete failure. Its legality had been questioned, and many of the members refused to sit (Pepys, May 1, 1667, vi. 296, 297).

<sup>6</sup> His speech may be read in *Parliamentary History*, iv. 367-8.

<sup>7</sup> The reason is not obvious, and it was whispered that some of the leading reformers who had expected seats resolved in their disappointment to wreck the scheme (Pepys, December 7, 8, vii. 230, 232). Sager counsels, however, prevailed.

<sup>8</sup> Pepys, January 4, 1667, vii. 266, 267.

<sup>9</sup> See 19 & 20 Car. II. c. 1, as abstracted in Hallam, edit. 1850, ii. 58. The Commission was invested with extensive and unusual powers as to auditing and investigating.

<sup>10</sup> C. Osborne, Tompson, Dunster, Turner, Laugham, and Gregory. Lord Brereton, however, was sixteen years President of the Royal Society, and we believe Mr. William Pierrepont of Thoresby, Notts, to be the distinguished Presbyterian. (See Marvell, Grosart's edition, ii. 228.) If Turner be the man who became Lord Mayor in 1669, he was favourable to Nonconformists (Baxter, *Reliquæ*, iii. 48). Baxter describes the Commission as 'very eminent for Ability and Impartiality and Sincerity' (iii. 21). Coventry approved its members as good, sober, and impartial (Pepys, vii. 245). Oldmixon (oddly enough, since he quotes Burnet so freely) does not mention Savile in the Commission.

scarcely had Parliament risen, ere Charles, with an evident desire to propitiate the Commissioner, conferred upon the young baronet the long-coveted distinction. December 28 Newcastle wrote 'to congratulate the son of his old friend. The warrant seems to have issued December 31.<sup>2</sup> On January 1 Pepys hears 'that Sir G. Savile one of the Parliamentary Committee of nine for examining the accounts is by the King made a Lord, the Lord Halifax, which, I believe, will displease the Parliament.'<sup>3</sup> Letters patent, wherein the antiquity of the family is extolled, while the good offices rendered by both Sir George and his father to his late Majesty 'of pious memory' receive a special recognition, issued in his favour January 13, 1667;<sup>4</sup> and on January 23 he was summoned for the ensuing session as Baron Savile of Eland and *Viscount Halifax*—titles carefully selected, as we perceive, with reference to the history of his family and its principal sphere of influence."

1667

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III

*A paper among the 'Longleat MSS.' (Letters of Henry Savile) endorsed in pencil 'Savile Estates, Yorkshire.' (About 1660.)*

acres (?) (p. 2)		acres (?) (p. 2)	
Yorkshire		Chidsell	. . 094 00 00
Thornhill	. 600 00 00	Andon	. . 080 00 00
Brierly	. . 555 00 00	Rushworth	. . 067 00 00
Emby	. . 540 00 00	Bothamhall	. . 060 00 00
Hunsworth	. . 210 00 00	Sevell (Lævell?)	. . 060 00 00
Eland	. . 230 00 00	Ovenden	. . 051 00 00
Denby	. . 166 00 00	Rawtenstall	. . 031 00 00
Soothill	. . 150 00 00	Stainland	. . 025 00 00
Wadsworth	. . 130 00 00	Stansfield	. . 023 00 00
Hanging Heaton	130 00 00	Mirfield	. . 017 00 00
South Olywram		Thurgoland	. . 017 00 00
and Exley	. 123 00 00	Thurlestone	. . 015 00 00

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (34).

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* (November 1667–September 1668), p. 106.

<sup>3</sup> Pepys, January 1, 1667, vii. 261.

<sup>4</sup> Bunke, *Extinct Peerages*, p. 475; *Lords' Journal*, February 6; and *Patent Rolls*.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* viii. 116 (Calendar of MSS. belonging to the House of Lords); *Lords' Journal*, February 6.

<sup>6</sup> 'S' Geo. Savill, it seems, chooses rather to beare the tytle of Viscount Hallifax than that of his family' (Bulstrode Papers, Thursday, December 6, 1667).



	ac.(?)l.(?)p.(?)		ac.(?)r.(?)p.(?)
Barkisland . . .	015 00 00	Oxford . . .	
Gretland . . .	015 17 00	Bampton . . .	200 00 00
Shelf . . .	015 15 00	Improvements.	
Heptonstall . . .	013 06 08	Upon Thornhill and	
Golear . . .	011 08 00	Emly by plowing	
Skercote . . .	007 00 00	the parkes about	
Wakefield . . .	006 12 00	(? above) 2 years	100/.
Newhall Orchard	008 00 00	Alveton . . .	200
Norland . . .	001 00 00	Bampton . . .	250
Ackworth, &c. . .	001 06 03	Wingfield, &c. . .	150
Kirkby . . .	200 00 00	Handsworth . . .	100
Mintgarth . . .	010 00 00	Bolerstone . . .	100
Nottinghamshire		Wrockwardine and	
Rufford . . .	1200 00 00	Cheswardine . . .	660
Lincolne		By woods yearly . .	250
Barroughby . . .	380 00 00	Besides timbers and	
Third parts, York-		other woods which	
shire		to be sold would	
Boleferstown . . .	135 00 00	be worth . . .	10,000/.
Handsworth . . .	100 00 00		
Derby			
Wingfield Arch	530 00 00	Debts . . .	5300
Sherland Stretton		Portions	
		To the Lady	
Derby, Middleton		Windsor . . .	7000
Eyam and Bam-		To Mr. Henry	
ford . . .	590 00 00	Savile . . .	1000
Staff Alveton . . .	213 00 00	Annuities the	
Shropshire		Lady Savile's	
Cheswardine . . .	055 00 00	jointure and Mr.	
Wrockwardine . .	068 07 00	Henry Savile's	
Taslev . . .	788 01 00	Annuitv included	2500

## CHAPTER IV

THE ASCENDENCY OF BUCKINGHAM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 'CABAL,'<sup>1</sup> 1667-72; EMBASSY OF 1672

WHEN on February 6, 1667, Lord Halifax, introduced by his young brother-in-law the Earl of Sunderland, and by Lord Fauconberg,<sup>2</sup> took his seat in the Upper House, of which he was soon to become one of the most distinguished members, a startling revolution in foreign policy had just taken place. The sudden irruption of France into the Spanish Netherlands, which had almost coincided with the Chatham disaster, had betrayed the ultimate designs of Louis XIV. upon the Spanish Succession, and had shown for the first time that in the ambition of the young Monarch and in the resources of his kingdom lay the principal menace to the equilibrium of Europe. 1667

The incident had caused a complete rupture between Holland and France, and men had wondered whether England, too, would recognise the importance of the crisis; whether she intended, or did not intend, to assert the principle of the balance of power. Charles II. had, in effect, offered his alliance to the highest bidder; and the States had made the more profitable proposals. During the January of the recess William Temple had effected the celebrated arrangement between the recently contending Powers, known to fame as the 'Triple Alliance.' England and the United Provinces, with the memories of Chatham behind them, confronted the world in all the reciprocal enthusiasm of a sudden reconciliation. It says

<sup>1</sup> The history of the word has been fully cleared up of late years, and it seems scarcely necessary to remind our readers that the word is originally the Hebrew equivalent of 'secret'; that it was early applied to 'private' meetings, especially among the members of the Privy Council, and was gradually appropriated to the Committee for Foreign Affairs or inner circle of the Council, the germ of the modern Cabinet (see especially Pepys, February 8, 1667, viii. 221), a development which aroused in its earlier stages extreme jealousy; that by a curious coincidence the leading members of the 'Cabal' between 1669 and 1673 (politicians whose known and suspected policies carried this jealousy to its supreme point) completed by their initials the letters of that word, and became thus, in a double sense, the 'Cabal' of English history.

<sup>2</sup> A Yorkshire peer, son-in-law of Cromwell.

1667-68 much for the political instinct of Englishmen that the Alliance, recent events notwithstanding, was extremely popular. The new Lord Halifax hailed the fresh departure in foreign politics with peculiar enthusiasm.<sup>1</sup> The friend of Coventry and of William Temple, he had grasped from the first the essential feature of the Continental situation, and through life remained constant to the principles of the Triple Alliance. It is scarcely too much to say that the maintenance of the European *status quo* became the cardinal doctrine of his political creed; 'the Greatness of France,' wrote a friend,<sup>2</sup> twenty years later, 'as I have heard your lordship observe, hath made all old Politicks useless.' \*

The business of the session, in which Lord Halifax from the first took an active part, need not detain us.<sup>3</sup> We hear of him, however, occasionally at the Board of Accounts. As early as January 31 Pepys in his official capacity had appeared before it,<sup>4</sup> and had found himself received with 'great respect and kindness.' His impression was favourable: 'upon the whole I do observe they do go about their business like men resolved to go through with it, and in a very good method, like men of understanding.'<sup>5</sup> His entry of July 3 records 'To Commissioners of Accounts at Brooke House. . . I long with them, and see them hot set on this matter, but I did give them proper and safe answers. Halifax, I perceive, was industrious on my side in behalf of his uncle Coventry.'

The Commission evidently inspired considerable respect,<sup>6</sup> not to say awe,<sup>7</sup> in naval circles; it reported in

<sup>1</sup> His letter of congratulation to Sir W. Temple has not, unfortunately, been preserved; but its enthusiastic tenor may be gathered from the answer in Temple's letters, March 2 (S.N.), 1668 (*Letters*, 1700, i. 300). See also the admirable account of these transactions in the *Character of a Trimmer*.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Methuen (Envoy at Li-bon) to Lord Halifax, September 31, 1694, in *Spencer MSS.* 31 (16).

<sup>3</sup> It was concluded May 8. The *Journals* show the constancy of his attendance.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Pepys, January 31, 1667, vii. 267; July 3, 1668, viii. 60.

<sup>5</sup> See also February 14, vii. 320, and July 4, viii. 61: 'Up, and to see Sir W. Coventry and give my account of my doings yesterday, which he well liked of, and was told thereof by my Lord Halifax before.' '8th . . . I find him much concerned in the present enquiries . . . he reckons himself and the rest very safe, but vexed to see us liable to these troubles.' &c. May 27, viii. 30, he records that one of the incriminated officials, with his counsel, had had 'base, rude usage' from the Commissioners, 'they behaving themselves like most insolent and ill-mannered men.' This criticism we find, however, emanated from the aggrieved lawyer.

<sup>6</sup> Pepys, August 28, 30, viii. 92, 95. The Commission is also mentioned, Pepys, September 2, 3, viii. 97; December 18, 1668, viii. 181; May 28, 1669, viii. 331, &c. (See also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, p. 68.)

<sup>7</sup> See Pepys, vii. 256, 258, 290, 298, 309, 315, 318, 331, 341, 404, 414, &c

due course,<sup>1</sup> to little practical result,<sup>2</sup> save that its investigations forced into a yet more invidious prominence the details of the prevailing mismanagement.<sup>3</sup> 1667-68

Meanwhile the general political situation as it concerns Lord Halifax is remarkable for the extraordinarily rapid decline of William Coventry's influence. He soon had reason to regret that he had assisted in replacing a Minister who, if arrogant and bigoted, was yet a statesman and a patriot, by the reckless and licentious Buckingham. With him, despite his brilliant abilities, politics, as grew hourly clearer, were but a passing freak. Relations between Sir William and the Duke became almost immediately strained; while Coventry's devotion to business<sup>4</sup> was a favourite topic of ridicule with Buckingham, who had keenly resented Sir William's opposition to the impeachment of the ex-Chancellor.<sup>5</sup> The Duke's personal fascination gave him an influence over the King to which Coventry could not pretend; nor was Charles unaware that to certain far-reaching schemes, at the moment rapidly developing, Sir William would offer uncompromising opposition. Four months after the fall of Clarendon, Coventry found himself excluded from the 'Cabinet' Council, and he confessed to Pepys that, except Sir John Duncombe and the Keeper, he had not a friend 'in the whole Court.'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The names of Halifax, Pierrepont, Turner, and Osborne are absent from the report presented to Parliament, October 26, 1669, at the commencement of the ensuing session. Halifax was one of the Committee to whom, November 6, the Lords referred the report, yet he certainly had not severed his connection with the Commission. (See *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* October 8, 1669, and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 2, p. 107, and *Bodleian MSS.*, Rawlinson D. 863 (May 18, 1670), for orders signed by Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> Ralph (i. 178) says, 'The poor Commissioners of Accounts were examin'd before the Council . . . and treated more as Offenders than Judges: and were at last obliged to put in a sort of Apology for having fulfilled their Commission, and acted like Men of Integrity and Honour' (the apology, dated January 28, 1669, is given in a footnote; it is unsigned, and the source is not given; it relates principally to the scope of the inquiry), 'tho even that apology is more than sufficient to Show that they had no Reason to make any at all.' But see Hallam, ii. 59 note.

<sup>3</sup> Hallam.

<sup>4</sup> See Pepys, viii. 21, 22, 59, 62. He refrained, however, from meddling in naval affairs (Pepys, viii. 113); showed a strong desire to propitiate Parliament (see Pepys, viii. 33); and eventually, February 16<sup>68</sup>, gave up in despair all attempts at reform, save in finance (Pepys, viii. 227).

<sup>5</sup> Pepys, September 2, November 27, December 3, 1667, vii. 93, 215, 222.

<sup>6</sup> Pepys, December 21, 30, vii. 244, 254; January 29, 16<sup>67</sup>, vii. 296. See also September 28, 1668, viii. 119. Sir John Duncombe was a colleague at the Treasury. Distrust of Buckingham created in time a certain tie between Coventry and the 'Clarendonians,' of whom the Duke of York was the chief (Pepys, October 23, 30, 1668, viii. 129, 135), but the alliance cannot have been very cordial, while it yet further lessened the little credit which Coventry still retained at Court. The old 'Place' scandal was also revived by his enemies (Pepys, February 18, 23, March 8, 24, 16<sup>67</sup>, April 20, 1668, vii. 326, 336, 355, 373).

His speedy downfall soon became a matter of common prophecy; and he prepared to acquiesce, not only with patience, but with equanimity.<sup>2</sup> Unquestioned ability, however, invested him with a certain lingering importance.<sup>3</sup> Buckingham oscillated between insolence and flattery, and at one moment offered to make Coventry 'Chief Minister of State' in return for his alliance.<sup>4</sup>

The climax was sudden and characteristic. On March 1, 1668, a rumour spread that either Halifax or Coventry had, through the medium of Henry Savile, challenged the Duke of Buckingham. Three days later, to the general consternation, Henry Savile was committed to the Gate-house<sup>5</sup> and William Coventry to the Tower. The facts soon transpired. In a play written for the 'King's House,' or theatre, Buckingham had introduced an obvious caricature of his colleague. Participation in the general laugh might have turned the edge of the satire; but a sense of humour was not perhaps Sir William's strong point, and he had suffered long. The news that a duel impended had soon reached the authorities,<sup>6</sup> and since, when examined at the Council Board, Coventry had refused to incriminate himself, his incarceration had followed. Two days later Sir William was expelled the Privy Council; the challenge serving obviously as a pretext, and, Buckingham's own record considered, a singularly indecent one.<sup>7</sup> 'I am not sorry,'

<sup>1</sup> See Pepys, October 23, 1668, viii. 129; 'Pierce do tell me . . . that the Duke of Buckingham is now all in all, and will ruin Coventry, if he can.'

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Thomas Thynne, *Longleat MSS.*, November 19, 1668. Pepys, January 29, vii. 296; December 7, 1668, viii. 174-5.

<sup>3</sup> Pepys, viii. 135.

<sup>4</sup> Pepys, March 6, 1668, viii. 250. For a curious attempt to make him accept a post in Ireland see Pepys, viii. 219.

<sup>5</sup> The Duke of York was highly indignant, and vowed a Gentleman of his Bedchamber might claim at worst the entry of the Tower. He was probably removed to the Tower on these remonstrances. (See *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* March 3, warrant to commit Coventry to the Tower; March 4, warrant to convey Savile thither.) Honest little Pepys, though well aware that he was braving the wrath of the omnipotent favourite, was assiduous in his visits, and records long and interesting conversations with Sir William. Others were equally attentive; in the course of a day or two, more than sixty couches drew up at the Tower, to the disgust of Charles and Buckingham.

<sup>6</sup> Through the Duke's second. If we surmise that he obeyed the wishes of his principal, we shall not, perhaps, act with injustice. We have already mentioned an affair with Lord Fauconberg, in which the Duke's courage had been impugned; and he was believed to have betrayed the secret of an encounter between himself and Lord Ossory in 1666 (*Carte's Ormonde*, iv. 270).

<sup>7</sup> A severe proclamation against duelling, which carries with it the authority of William Coventry among others, had emanated from the

wrote Charles (March 7) to his sister, Henriette d'Orléans,<sup>1</sup> 1658  
 'that Sr Will.<sup>l</sup> Coventry has given me this good occasion . . . to turne him out of the Councill. I do intend to turn him allso out of the Tresury. The truth of it is, he has been a troublesome man in both places, and I am well rid of him.' On the 11th accordingly his place in the Treasury Commission was transferred to Buckingham's favourite, Sir Thomas Osborne, the former friend of Lord Halifax. On the 21st, after more than a fortnight's imprisonment, which Coventry endured philosophically,<sup>2</sup> and his second with characteristic hilarity,<sup>3</sup> the two were released,<sup>4</sup> in disgrace.' From this time forth Sir William, who had scarcely passed his fortieth year, withdrew, as far as possible, from public life; satisfied, perhaps, that the experiment he had proposed himself in the presence of Pepys, seven years before, 'Whether it was possible for a man to keep himself up in Court by dealing plainly and walking uprightly,' had been resolved in the negative. In the House of Commons, indeed, from which he was unable to retire,<sup>5</sup> his abilities, his high character, and his statesmanlike moderation retained for him an ascendancy which he did not covet, and which, in fact, he rather deprecated; but, his Parliamentary duties apart, he subsided into a country gentleman, the friend and mentor of innumerable nephews and nieces.

With the Saviles he maintained, as before, a peculiar intimacy, and it is impossible to doubt that the final rupture with Buckingham involved Lord Halifax. His sympathies during the whole course of Ministerial altercation must have lain with his uncle; and he had, moreover, for more than twelve months experienced a second

Council a year before, in consequence of the fatal and infamous duel between Buckingham, the seducer of the Countess of Shrewsbury, and her injured husband. For this crime, as we must call it, Buckingham held the royal pardon. The proclamation is in *Lords' Journal*, April 1668, xii. 216.

<sup>1</sup> Miss Cartwright's *Madame*, p. 283.      <sup>2</sup> Pepys, March 4, viii. 245, &c.

<sup>3</sup> On March 11 he had entertained a highly convivial party in the Tower—Lord Rochester, the Duke of Richmond, and James Hamilton (*Ibid.* *MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, p. 62).

<sup>4</sup> The warrant for Coventry's release is dated March 20 (*Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.*). Henry Savile obtained his liberty simultaneously. On his release the King refused to see him.

<sup>5</sup> For the general regret see Pepys, viii. 256.

<sup>6</sup> He was unable for ten years to vacate his seat. There was no Place Act at this time; the ingenious fiction of the Chiltern Hundreds had not, therefore, developed, and nothing short of a dissolution could sever the tie between a member and his representatives. The first Parliament of Charles II. lasted eighteen years; and Coventry, who had been elected in 1661, perforce retained his seat till 1679.

1668. 72 vicarious injury at the hands of the profligate Duke. As a kinsman of the Shrewsbury family and guardian to its orphaned representative<sup>1</sup> Lord Halifax cannot have failed to resent the scandalous connection between the widowed Countess and Buckingham, her husband's murderer.<sup>2</sup> To Halifax, as we have seen, the challenge had been originally attributed; he had been among the first to condole with the imprisoned statesman,<sup>3</sup> and the disgrace of his own brother lent an additional sting to the situation.<sup>4</sup>

How far the episode affected his political relations it is difficult to judge. In fact, the entire political outlook from 1668 to 1671 is perplexing in the extreme. The wave of public indignation which had overthrown Lord Clarendon had concentrated power in the hands of a knot of statesmen who, if connected by any common political bond, were united in their dislike of stringent ecclesiastical legislation. But, the crisis over, it became evident that a Parliamentary majority still clung to the High Anglican policy of the statesman it had repudiated. A minority indeed supported the principle of toleration, which had become the watchword of the new leaders and of Charles himself; but this minority, which included such members of either House as still retained a taint of Puritan sentiment,<sup>5</sup> with the more thoughtful and conscientious heirs of Royalist tradition,<sup>6</sup> showed in other respects an alarming tendency to criticise the general administration. For such criticism there was ample scope, since it became only too rapidly evident that the dismissal of Clarendon, had not diminished official corruption, increased the efficiency of the services, or stayed the waste of public money. Our fragmentary knowledge leads us to connect both Halifax and Sir William Coventry with the efforts of this critical and reforming minority; which had, moreover, the sympathy of Lord Ashley,<sup>7</sup> who alone among the

<sup>1</sup> *Lords' Journal*, xii. 401.

<sup>2</sup> 'The late duell and murder' is Pepys' description of the tragedy (February 5, 1667).

<sup>3</sup> Pepys, March 4, viii. 245.

<sup>4</sup> It is possible, moreover, that Halifax may have been on bad terms with Lord Arlington. In *Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* October 9, 1669, we find a *protégé* of Lord Arlington complaining that, in the case of a university appointment, he has been postponed to a nominee of Halifax.

<sup>5</sup> As for instance Marvell, Fauconberg, Anglesey, Delamere.

<sup>6</sup> Lucas, Clare, and Essex, to mention no others, all came of Cavalier families. The same definition, of course, applies to Coventry and Halifax.

<sup>7</sup> We are inclined to suspect at this period an increased intimacy between Halifax and Ashley. A letter in the *Spencer MSS.* 31 (37), which belongs to this period, asks for his influence with Lord Ashley as well as that of Sir William. They were certainly much thrown together by the exigencies of Parliamentary life. Thus, from October 1669 to April 1670

Ministers of 1669-73 can lay claim to enlightened views and comprehensive schemes of political improvement. 1668-72

Unfortunately, however, the political bias of Lord Halifax between 1668-72 is traceable in three instances only. The Roos Divorce Bill – the first Act which countenanced remarriage during the lifetime of a divorced wife, the validity of whose original marriage was not questioned – seems to have been regarded as a political feeler on the part of Buckingham, the prelude to the King's divorce and remarriage. Ashley supported the Bill; on what grounds is not clear.<sup>1</sup> Lord Halifax, in common with his uncles William<sup>2</sup> and Henry Coventry, opposed it; and he was one of the few lay Protestants who on two occasions joined with the Duke of York, the Bishops, and the Papist Lords in recording their dissent.<sup>3</sup>

Lord Halifax further opposed the second Conventicle Bill,<sup>4</sup> which measure, stigmatised by Marvel as the 'quintessence of arbitrary malice,' deserved this character rather by the severity of its definitions<sup>5</sup> and the despotic power it confers upon the Justices of the Peace<sup>6</sup> than by the extent of the penalties imposed. In the House of Lords it encountered severe opposition, and was debated 'by inches' in Committee; the minority, supported by Government, carried several modifying amendments,<sup>7</sup> and

Halifax was a member – we gather, a prominent member – of the Committee appointed to consider the decay of rents and the improvement of trade, of which Committee Ashley was the moving spirit (*Lords' Journal*, xii. 277-8, Ac.). During Coventry's imprisonment Halifax was added to the 'Council of Trade,' which owed its existence to Ashley (*Cal. Stat. Pap. Dom.* March 5, 1669).

<sup>1</sup> Christie. His action excited surprise, as his son had just married one of the heiresses.

Grey's *Debates*, i. 253, 255. The knight justly remarked that, in the name of logic and common fairness, a clause allowing remarriage generally under similar circumstances appeared the necessary corollary; for such an expedient he avowed himself unprepared: 'He that has read deepest is in doubt.'

<sup>2</sup> *Lords' Journal*, xii. 311, 329.

<sup>3</sup> Introduced in the Commons 1669, fell with the prorogation, reintroduced 1670.

<sup>4</sup> Any meeting at which five persons were present under pretence of religion became, unless sanctioned by the Liturgy, a seditious conventicle within the meaning of the Act; no evidence of malicious intent was required, the onus of disproof lying on the accused.

<sup>5</sup> A single magistrate could convict, fines might be levied in default upon other members of the same conventicle, and a special proviso ensured the construction of the Act, 'most largely and beneficially for the justification of all that execute it.' Moreover, unlike the former Bill, it was designed to be perpetual.

<sup>7</sup> They raised the minimum attendance from five to ten, and secured the intervention of a jury. For the curious 'supremacy' clause, see Grey; Marvel; *Lords' Journal*.



1670 when on the third reading the question 'Whether the Bill with the Amendments, Alterations, and Provisos, now read shall pass' was resolved in the affirmative, Lord Halifax took part with the seventeen peers<sup>1</sup> who entered a final protest. Lord Halifax appears also to have advocated a reform of the Parliamentary Privilege system, the abuse of which in the seventeenth century constituted a standing disgrace. The measure,<sup>2</sup> however, which had the support of Ashley, met with great obstruction, and was eventually rejected; perhaps from resentment of a gross violation of Parliamentary privilege in the person of a cousin of Lord Halifax, Sir John Coventry, which marked the winter recess of 1670. The debates on that disgraceful outrage gave, moreover, a definiteness to party divisions; and we shall henceforward speak of a 'Court' and a 'Country' party.<sup>3</sup>

About the same time the Parliamentary attendance of Lord Halifax was interrupted by a personal calamity. On the night of December 16, 1670, his wife died<sup>4</sup> suddenly, as we may presume, since her husband was in the House that day<sup>5</sup>—and on December 31 she was buried at Thornhill. Her age must have fallen short of thirty years, and she left her husband a widower at thirty-seven with four young children—Henry, aged nine years; Anne, of the age of seven; William, who must have been about five years old; and George, a child under the age of four.

During the same winter the young Prince of Orange,<sup>6</sup> nephew to the English King and a prominent citizen of

<sup>1</sup> Denbigh, Manchester, Essex, Clare, Anglesey, Dover, Wharton, Wiltoughby, Delamere, Eure, Say and Sele, Howard, Lucas, Holles, Sandys, Montague, Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> Introduced December 16, 1670; rejected March 9, 1671. (See Draft, *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* viii. 153.) A passage in Hallam, ii. 432 (edit. 1850), though not perfectly clear (compare lines 11 and 31), suggests that under existing rules privilege could be pleaded in respect of a member's entire property and during his whole tenure of the seat. The Bill proposed that in future privilege should be restricted—first, to the persons of members and their menial servants, with their ordinary dwellings and the contents of the same; and, secondly, to the actual term of each session with twenty days before and after. Among the sixteen Lords who protested, first against the refusal to commit the Bill, and then against the rejection, we notice Ashley, Anglesey, Fauconberg, and Delamere, all survivors of the old Presbyterian party; Lucas, Clare, Essex, and Halifax, of the new Royalist Opposition. For Lucas and Clare, see Marvell (Grosart's edit.), ii. 391, and Baxter's *Itinerary*, part iii. p. 84; for Essex, see Burnet (1833 edit.), ii. 99.

<sup>3</sup> But Henry Savile, writing in July 1670 to his brother, says: 'I am pretty sure the court commendation for St Ed[ward] Deering would not stand in competition with such an interest as I am certain it is in your power to procure for me' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 25).

<sup>4</sup> 'In her house in Lincoln's Inn Fields' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii. part 7, p. 74).

<sup>5</sup> *Lords' Journal*, xii. p. 391.

<sup>6</sup> Harris, *Life of William*, book i. p. 6. He was in England October 1670 to February 1671.

the Dutch Republic, came to England on private affairs. 1670 The visit suggests a possible introduction between Lord Halifax and the future Stadtholder, which is not without interest in view of succeeding developments; for the pro-rogation which took place a few months later<sup>1</sup> marks the beginning of a new political era. A period of two years followed, during which no session took place. This interval saw the evolution (as it concluded, with the utter collapse) of the one great political design which Charles II. ever elaborated—the reduction, namely, of England to the obedience of the Roman See.

The motives for this remarkable undertaking have been, we think, very generally misunderstood. It was, we fancy, connected to a very slight extent with that superficial personal preference for Roman Catholic doctrine which Halifax, in his ‘Character of Charles II.,’ so admirably characterises, and which led to the death-bed reconciliation. The real motive was political. Convinced that ‘an Impliciteness in Religion is necessary for ye safety of Government,’ and ‘that all Inquisitiveness into these things’ is ‘mischievous to the state,’<sup>2</sup> Charles further believed that the divisions of the sects and the sacerdotalism of the High Church party would render the task of reunion a feasible one, if facilitated by concessions on the part of Rome<sup>3</sup> and by support from abroad.

The fall of that staunch Protestant, Clarendon, and the sincere though secret conversion of the Duke of York to the Roman faith, accelerated the design; and six weeks prior to the disgrace of Coventry, with which perhaps it was not unconnected, took place<sup>4</sup> the mysterious conference<sup>5</sup> which issued eighteen months later in the famous secret ‘Treaty of Dover. By this treaty, the existence of which

<sup>1</sup> April 22, 1671.

<sup>2</sup> This characteristic is noted in these words in the original draft of Burnet’s *History*, contemporary with the early part of the reign (British Museum, *Harl. MSS.* 6584, f. 26).

<sup>3</sup> See further Dalrymple, i. 88-95; the declaration of 1660 (Kennett, iii. 25-6); the confession of faith said to have been transmitted by Charles to the Pope (von Ranke and Father Boero). The whole of Boero’s pamphlet is extremely curious, though Lingard, who had seen copies of the papers at Stonyhurst, attached little importance to them (Stonyhurst papers in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iii. p. 339). The situation is admirably described by von Ranke, vol. iv. p. 374: ‘Grievous as the interference of Rome had appeared to earlier Monarchs, it had become even desirable in comparison with a system which involved the religious and secular supremacy of Parliament.’

<sup>4</sup> Feast of St. Paul’s Conversion, 1669.

<sup>5</sup> Between Charles, the Duke of York, Lord Arlington with his confidant Lord Clifford, and Lord Arundel, one of the heads of the Roman interest in England.

1670-72 was known to Lords Arlington and Clifford<sup>1</sup> alone among the Ministry, the King of France binds himself to further with men and money the restoration of the Papal economy in England, on condition that Charles, by the sacrifice of the United Provinces, at that moment his ally, shall endorse the designs of Louis upon the Spanish succession.<sup>2</sup>

Six months later the signatures of the Protestant Ministers, Ashley, Buckingham, and Lauderdale (from whom the provisions—nay, the very existence—of the secret treaty remained studiously concealed), were obtained for a formal convention with France specifically directed against the United Provinces. The fraud was completely successful, and Ashley in especial proved a remarkably easy dupe. Trained among the overwhelming domestic dilemmas of the Civil War, his indifference to foreign politics, save as the lever of internal intrigue, was ever remarkable, and his interest in mercantile questions rendered him peculiarly sensitive to the commercial jealousies which raged between England and Holland.<sup>3</sup> He was, moreover, particularly gratified by the Declaration of Indulgence,<sup>4</sup> which preceded by two days the actual rupture with the States. The necessities of the Popish intrigue required that the Nonconformists should be conciliated by an offer of toleration: but Ashley saw in the measure nothing save the adoption of that statesmanlike policy which he had long and consistently advocated.

By his nephew, Lord Halifax, however, the gist of the situation was from the first clearly grasped. His enthusiasm for the principles of the Triple League inspired him with the strongest repugnance for the French Alliance: and private information as to the religious sentiments of the Duke of York confirmed to him with unmistakable plainness the real drift of the Declaration of Indulgence.

<sup>1</sup> Both of whom inclined secretly to Romanism.

<sup>2</sup> See the treaty, in Lingard. Fifth edition, vol. ix. p. 503.

<sup>3</sup> It must be further remembered: (a) That with the assistance of Buckingham he obtained some addition to England's share of the spoil (Goree and Worne, besides Waleheren, Cadsant, and the town of Sluys); (b) that he opposed the development of a French naval supremacy; (c) that his attempts to secure by an appeal to Parliament the approbation and support of the Houses were thwarted by his colleagues; and (d) that the fraudulent appropriation of the assigned funds lying in the Exchequer which became in consequence necessary took place in defiance of his remonstrances (Christie, ii. 22-32, 52-56). It is much to his discredit that he afterwards (speech of 1673) stooped to justify in an official capacity the act of national bankruptcy against which he had in vain protested.

<sup>4</sup> Called the Second Declaration. The First Declaration, of 1662, also instigated by Ashley and his friends, had been withdrawn in consequence of Parliamentary remonstrances.

The despotic character of the measure was calculated 1672 to disgust even the most tolerant spirits of the new Opposition, while Halifax in especial realised how violent a resentment it would arouse in the Parliamentary majority by which the Conventicle Bill had been so recently carried. The Duke of York had boasted that the stricter Anglicans must, upon the principles of passive obedience, submit. 'My Lord Halifax reply'd,' records James himself,<sup>1</sup> 'His Highness would soon see the contrary as to' (these) 'who he was sure would roare out against this declaration with all their might.' The extreme unpopularity both of the Indulgence and of the war soon became evident, and as a sop to the popular feeling<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax and three others like-minded<sup>3</sup> were admitted, within a month of the declaration of war, into the Privy Council; it even appears as if the appointment of Halifax to the Viceroyalty of Ireland had been mooted.<sup>4</sup> Six weeks later his uncle Henry Coventry, Ambassador to the Court of Stockholm,<sup>5</sup> was selected for the vacant post of Secretary,<sup>6</sup> and the young Privy Councillor offered his congratulations in the following graceful fashion:-

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Coventry.*

June 3d 72.<sup>7</sup>

Dear Uncle Though I sent you no compliments to Sweden, I cannot hold congratulating your returne from it. That alone is ground enough for your friends to reioyce with you, and it is not the worse, that from the minute you are no more my L<sup>d</sup> Embassadour, you will at least bee M<sup>r</sup> Secretary: upon these termes you may bee the better content to part with Excellency, and all the worship belonging to your character,<sup>8</sup> since you have something in exchange for it. I expect you will bear it with Christian patience, that you are no more to wait upon the K's person in the bed chamber, nor represent his person in foreigne countries: never more to see Stockholme and for ever to take your leave of Brother Philipson are afflicting things, tis confessed, but you must submit to your ill fate and make the best on't, in great earnest there is an universell ioy for the K's choice of you, whether that is a compliment to you

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, by Clarke (J. S.), ii. 137 (from the memoirs).    <sup>2</sup> Kennet, iii. 287.

<sup>3</sup> Fauconberg, Essex, Bridgewater, April 17, 1672 (*London Gazette*, No. 669).

<sup>4</sup> The Halifax note book at Devonshire House.

<sup>5</sup> He had gone thither for the second time in the preceding year.

<sup>6</sup> See some severe reflections on his appointment to the Secretaryship in the *Growth of Popery* by Marvell, iv. 271. who yet describes him as an honest man; also the bitter extracts from Coke in Kennet, iii. 284.

<sup>7</sup> Unpublished MSS. *Longleat*.

<sup>8</sup> His letter of recall had probably issued in April.

<sup>9</sup> I.e. official character.

1672 or no I will not determine I rather incline to believe it ought to be matter of humiliation to you, considering how little the world is disposed to approve anything that is good: the truth is you are popular to a scandal and I am tempted to love you the less because everybody else is so kind to you I think I was the first man the King told of his actual choice of you, for upon the first notice of your predecessors death,<sup>1</sup> I being then in the room, he called me to him, and acquainted me with his resolution concerning you; I made the best complements for you I could at that time; when you come yourself you will make better, and in the mean time, pray believe it is none when I assure you of my being

Dear Uncle,

Your most affectionate Nephew and humble servant

HALIFAX.

Within a very few days after the despatch of this missive the new Privy Councillor was himself selected for a diplomatic mission, the only one in which he was ever engaged. The war had begun in earnest.<sup>2</sup> A few weeks before the declaration of hostilities the young Prince of Orange had been hurriedly appointed<sup>3</sup> Captain-General and Admiral of the Dutch armaments, in the vain hope that this appointment might mollify the young man's uncle, the English King; and the courage and ability of the youthful soldier<sup>4</sup> were soon and terribly tested. With an admirably equipped force of 100,000 men<sup>5</sup> and an English reinforcement under the Duke of Monmouth, bastard son of the English King, Louis overran or effectively menaced five out of the seven Provinces, and, compelling the young General with his meagre force of 13,000 men to retire before him, fixed his headquarters at Utrecht.<sup>6</sup> Despair fell upon the States-General and upon the ill-armed, ill-disciplined soldiery which they had systematically neglected in favour of the marine forces. Their consternation and the supplicatory embassies despatched to both Kings contrasted unfavourably with the undaunted attitude of the young General, who, disposing his little army round The Hague and Amsterdam, prepared to sell as dearly

<sup>1</sup> Sir John Trevor died May 28, about a week before the date of this letter (*London Gazette*, No. 682).

<sup>2</sup> Mignet, iv. 1, &c.

<sup>3</sup> February 25, 1672 (N.S.).

<sup>4</sup> He had attained his twenty-first year.

<sup>5</sup> Which marks in the opinion of Napoleon an epoch in the art of war. He was also supported by the troops of his German allies.

<sup>6</sup> June 1<sup>st</sup>. For the murderous though indecisive naval encounter between the Dutch and the combined fleets, see Harry Saville's description in the *London Gazette* (No. 670), which has been often reprinted. It took place

May 28  
June 7

as possible the two remaining Provinces. His firmness 1672 excited a very general enthusiasm, which soon culminated in a political revolution.

At this crisis the birth of a son<sup>1</sup> to the triumphant Louis called for the usual complimentary embassy on the part of his English ally. Such a mission, moreover, afforded a welcome opportunity for renewed professions of loyalty to an alliance which the terrified authorities of the United Provinces by their separate appeals had hoped to weaken.<sup>2</sup> On June 10<sup>3</sup> M. Colbert, French Ambassador at the Court of St. James, informs his Government that a certain Lord Halifax has been selected for this errand. 'Milord Halifax,' he proceeds, 'a de la qualité, de grand biens, et beaucoup d'esprit; il a même temoigné par sa conduite envers moi le grand respect et la vénération qu'il a pour le Roi notre Maître, mais il m'a paru jusques à present assez contraire à la bonne union qui est entre la France et l'Angleterre.'<sup>4</sup> J'espère qu'il reviendra avec d'autres sentimens ainsi que tous les autres qui ont eu l'honneur d'entretenir sa Majesté.' Two days later he adds a pregnant warning: 'Milord Arlington m'a prié de vous avertir que Milord Halifax qui va trouver le Roi ne sait rien de la grande affaire'<sup>5</sup> (is ignorant of the scheme for the re-establishment of Popery). To us the appointment appears something of an enigma. The embassy, we admit, was in the main a formal one; and diplomacy in those days seems to have been regarded as the most appropriate introduction to an official career.<sup>6</sup> It seems, however, equally strange that Lord Halifax should have desired, and should have obtained, a mission designed to cement an alliance his antipathy to which was notorious. The fact, however, remains. On June 14 Lord Halifax received his

<sup>1</sup> Louis François, Duc d'Anjou, died in the following October or November (Carac's *Ormonde*, iv. 600).

<sup>2</sup> It probably appeared the more necessary because rumour reported that the French successes were distasteful to the Court as to the people (Transcripts of the *Dutch Secret Despatches* of 1672, British Museum, Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. PPP, June 7. 10 [n.s.]; see also *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 91).

<sup>3</sup> June 10.

<sup>4</sup> The italics are our own.

<sup>5</sup> Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 85 (from the original in the Archives of the French Foreign Office).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 86.

<sup>7</sup> Preparations for which were at the moment eagerly canvassed. See the extraordinary despatch of June 7 (Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. app. ii.).

<sup>8</sup> Examples: Henry Coventry, Lord Sunderland (who had been appointed a few months earlier Ambassador to Spain), Jenkins, Arlington, Williamson, &c. &c.

1672 instructions, which we print in full. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to remind the reader of certain provisions in the existing treaty between England and France. By that instrument the obliteration of the United Provinces from the map of Europe is implicitly contemplated, with the tacit agreement that the Dutch territory shall be shared between the allies. France arrogates to herself the lion's share; while England reserves as her modest portion a considerable part of the province of Zealand, comprising four islands<sup>1</sup> with the town of Sluys. Charles had entered a special stipulation in favour of his nephew, the young Prince of Orange (at that moment, be it remembered, a subject of the States, precluded by express law from the Stadtholdership), in the form of a proviso that he should be, if possible, a gainer by the war.<sup>2</sup> Finally, both Kings had undertaken that neither should engage in *separate* negotiation with the States.

Instrucons<sup>3</sup> for Our Right trusty and well beloved Cozen and Councell<sup>r</sup> George Viscount Hallifax going in Quality of our Envoye Extra<sup>o</sup> to y<sup>e</sup> most Ch<sup>r</sup>istian King att Whitehall 14 June 1672 Charles R.

You shall transport yo<sup>r</sup> selfe w<sup>th</sup> what convenient speed you can unto Bruges in y<sup>e</sup> Spanish Low Countray, attending o<sup>r</sup> dearest Brother<sup>1</sup> in your way, who will furnish you with a convenience for youre transportation. Being at Bruges you shall expect there the States Generalis Passeport for your more secure passage to the camp of y<sup>e</sup> most Ch<sup>r</sup>istian King.

Where being arrived you shall deliver your Credentiall letter,<sup>2</sup> expressing to him our Joye for the birth of his son, and congratulating to him y<sup>e</sup> happy progresse of his armes against the Common Enemy.

You shall further acquaint him with the overture made Us by the Dutch Amb<sup>r</sup> for their admittance hither, of 4 Deputyes from the States Generall his Masters to treat & conclude a peace adding that they have deputed the like number to him the most Ch<sup>r</sup>istian King, w<sup>ch</sup> you shall lett him know wee looke upon as an artifice to divide us, thinkeing thereby to oblige us to treat w<sup>th</sup> them apart one from another, or at the least by a suspension of armes to frustrate the good events of this Campagne by sea and Land; that instead of entertaining this Overture of a treaty, wee are wholly of the mind, that wee doe

<sup>1</sup> Goeree, Voorn, Cadzant, and Walcheren.

<sup>2</sup> 'Trouve ses avantages dans la continuation et fin de cette guerre.'

<sup>3</sup> Record Office *State Papers* (foreign: France), June 1672, bundle 282 (ff. 239-40) (copy). There is a second and shorter copy which appears to be in the hand of Lord Halifax. The documents relating to this embassy have never, we believe, been hitherto consulted.

<sup>4</sup> The Duke of York, commanding the fleet.

<sup>5</sup> This has not been recovered.

both apply, o<sup>r</sup> selves with oure utmost vigour & endeavours 1672  
to press the States Generall to the ends prescribed in our  
treaty, viz. not onely to mortify their pride, but (if it should  
please God soe farr to bless y<sup>e</sup> successe of oure armes) even to  
dissolve their government, now become soe incompatible with  
all their Neighboures.

That having putt our selfe to soe vast an Expence exceed-  
ing all oure first Computations, we can not thinke it fit to desist  
from the warr, till we have attained the particular advantages  
wee promised to oure selfe by it, viz. the seing oure selves  
possessed of those places expressed in the treaty for our share  
in the Conquest. That apprehending wee may be further  
molested w<sup>th</sup> Overtures of this nature, and our allyes abroad  
amused with a belief that wee are treating with y<sup>e</sup> dutch, wee  
have again called upon the Dutch Amb<sup>r</sup> to leave y<sup>e</sup> Kingdome,  
w<sup>ch</sup> he hath now effectively done, the truth of this matter being,  
that at the times wee would have had him depart (w<sup>ch</sup> hath  
been for these 2 moneths past) the wind hath continued soe con-  
trary, that he could not gett out of the river, or if he would y<sup>e</sup>  
conjuncture was such as wee did not thinke it fitt to lett him goe.

*Whatever you are directed hereby to say to the most Chilian  
King, you must in yourre publique discourse abstaine from dis-  
covering our aversion to a present Treaty, it being a thing of an  
ill sound both at home and abroad.<sup>1</sup>*

In your passage through Zealand <sup>2</sup> you shall put your selfe  
to enquire as far as you can w<sup>th</sup> safety to your selfe, whether  
that State may be prevailed upon to put themselves under our  
protection, and what operation our declaration for the encourag-  
ing the subjects of y<sup>e</sup> united provinces to come into England <sup>3</sup>  
is like to have upon y<sup>e</sup> people, or any other of the said united  
provinces, off all w<sup>ch</sup> you shall give us the most speedy ac-  
count you can, and if any addresse be made to you from such  
person-, as you can thinke are of weight or value in y<sup>e</sup> Govern-  
ment you shall encourage them w<sup>th</sup> an assurance of o<sup>r</sup> protection  
as farr as you may doe without exposing yourre person to any  
hazard.

At Yourre first and all subsequent audiances w<sup>th</sup> the most  
Chilian King, you shall assure in y<sup>e</sup> most convincing termes you  
can devise of our entire satisfacon in his friendship, and his  
whole proceeding ever since the beginning of all our late  
trausactions <sup>4</sup> to this day & of our firme resolution to corrispond  
therewith by all the acts of friendship within our power.

You shall conferr w<sup>th</sup> S<sup>r</sup> W<sup>m</sup> Lockert & M<sup>r</sup> Sedney  
Godolphin, <sup>5</sup> upon the designes sufficiency & progresse of the  
French army w<sup>th</sup> the relation to o<sup>r</sup> treaty, & transmit to us

<sup>1</sup> The italics are our own. <sup>2</sup> Of which Walcheren formed part.

<sup>3</sup> June 12, *London Gazette*, No. 685.

<sup>4</sup> Probably a concealed reference to the Treaty of Dover.

<sup>5</sup> English representative at the Court of Versailles. In despatches of  
June 18, 19, he expressed his anxiety for the arrival of Halifax, and regret  
that his powers were so limited.



1672 your joint opinions of what you shall judge most conducive to our service in this Conjunction

When you shall finde yo<sup>r</sup> time proper for it, you shall minde y<sup>e</sup> most Ch<sup>t</sup>ian King of y<sup>e</sup> article in our treaty referring to a further Conceit, the agreeing of some things in favo<sup>r</sup> of o<sup>r</sup> Nephew y<sup>e</sup> Prince of Orange, telling how proper y<sup>e</sup> time is for it now by the happy progresse of our affaires and the true Condition of his, with such probabilities of the dissolution of that Government. When you have acquitted Yourselfe of o<sup>r</sup> Compliments, and informed Yourself as far as you can of y<sup>e</sup> King's mind and intentions towards his further progresse by warr or treaty w<sup>th</sup> that government, you shall returne to us, w<sup>th</sup> all speed by the way that seems most secure and proper for you.

You shall acquaint y<sup>e</sup> most Ch<sup>t</sup>ian King in what Condition our fleet is to take y<sup>e</sup> sea againe, how that their first orders are to goe upon y<sup>e</sup> Coast of Holland, where if it be found feasible of making a probable attempt by land, wee shall call for the assistance of those forces that he hath left under the command of y<sup>e</sup> Duke d'Elbœuf to that effect towards which wee shall be glad to receive any further assistance y<sup>t</sup> he can spare us.

Since y<sup>e</sup> forming those Instrucons it happens, that tow deputyes Ex<sup>ts</sup> (as they give themselves out of be) arriving here in the river w<sup>th</sup> out any passeport from us, or soe much as o<sup>r</sup> knowledge, the Dutch amb<sup>r</sup>, who was already on his way homewards as farr as Gravesend, there met w<sup>th</sup> them and finding himselfe joined in y<sup>e</sup> same Deputacon thought himselfe obliged to returne hither, but wee being made acquainted with it, forthwith ordered them all three to passe to Hampton Court, w<sup>th</sup> out haveing seen any of them, with order to remaine there till we shall have heard from y<sup>e</sup> most Ch<sup>t</sup>ian King, y<sup>e</sup> subject of our Errand,<sup>1</sup> of w<sup>ch</sup> you must therefor particularly give this account to the said most Ch<sup>t</sup>ian King.

Lord Halifax appears to have started that day or the next, and we find him accompanied in quality of secretary by one James Vernon.<sup>2</sup> The passage to Calais proved very bad; the vessel in which the Embassy crossed was detained twelve hours at Calais Roads; and

<sup>1</sup> These events are described in the *Dutch Secret Despatches* of June 15. On that day, upon his return from the coast with the deputation, the Ambassador had an audience of the King, who then said he was in such good understanding with France that he must first communicate with her, 'and that he should do it through a person of quality, who at the same time should felicitate the birth of a young Prince.' The Dutchmen tried in vain to insinuate jealousy and suspicion of France, the King reiterated that his emissary must return ere he could speak with the deputation. Later in the same day Lord Arlington had requested that a passport for the Lord Viscount Halifax, being of his Majesty's Privy Council, with his baggage and suite, to serve him through the States dominions to the French camp, should be sent to Bruges.

<sup>2</sup> Probably the same who afterwards acted as secretary to the Duke of Monmouth, Gazetteer, and Under-Secretary of State. His correspondence in the latter capacity has been published.

the sufferings of the unfortunate diplomatist appear to have been, in an unusual degree, protracted and severe. The following letter from Mr. Vernon, probably addressed to Williamson, Lord Arlington's secretary, was written on arrival : -

*James Vernon (to Mr. Williamson ?).*

Calais 29 June <sup>1</sup>

Sr, My Lord is arrived here safe, though he hath not been exempt from the effects of the Sea. Wee lay at Anchor last night in Calais Roade a league & halfe from the Towne. My Lord went ashore this morning and is preparing to go for Dunkirke this night. The Duke de Charrost Governor of the Towne hath sent a Major to enquire of My L<sup>dy</sup> health & invite him to dinner which My Lord hath not time to accept of; but intends him a visitt in retorne of his Civility before he goes.

The latest letters from the Army talke of the taking Utrecht,<sup>2</sup> Laerden,<sup>3</sup> Nimmegen,<sup>4</sup> Schinck Scans (?) Zutphen,<sup>5</sup> Doesberg,<sup>7</sup> &c. Utrecht they say hath demanded a Garrison of 3000 men from the King to secure them against the Prince of Orange.

Amsterdam is threatend if they do not presently yeeld, to ly deeper under water then they do.

They say they have demanded passage for the States Deputyes to treat of surrendring, perhaps they may bee the same, That went to the Army when others came for England.

I am Sr by all Obligations

yo<sup>r</sup> most Obedient and faithfull servant

J. VERNON.

Meanwhile Lord Halifax reported to Lord Arlington : -

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Arlington.*

My L<sup>dy</sup> - To iustify my diligence, I beg leave to assure you L<sup>dy</sup>, I have made all the hast hither that could possibly consist with my attendance upon his Royall Highnesse by the way and a high wind that hindred mee at least twelve howres from coming in after wee were in the Road : to make amends for that delay, I intend, though not quite recovered, of my sea sicknesse, to go this night to Dunkirk, upon the strength of 5 or 6 howres rest I have had in this town. I come iust

<sup>1</sup> *State Papers* (foreign : France), June 1672, bundle 282, No. 272.

<sup>2</sup> Taken June 1<sup>st</sup> (*Œuvres de Louis XIV.* iii. 247).

<sup>3</sup> Leerdam, taken June 11<sup>th</sup> (*ibid.*).

<sup>4</sup> Knotsenbourg or 'Poit de Nimègue' was taken June 10<sup>th</sup>, Nimeguen not till June 29<sup>th</sup> (*ibid.*).

<sup>5</sup> This word is rather illegible. A fort de Schuik was taken June 1<sup>st</sup>; Swartensluis, June 14<sup>th</sup> (*ibid.*).

<sup>6</sup> Taken June 15<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Taken June 12<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> June 19<sup>th</sup>, *State Papers* (foreign : French), 282, f. 276. Holograph original endorsed 'received June 23' (o.s.).

1672 now from dining with M<sup>r</sup> de Bethune who hath been extremely civill to mee, and was the first man that told mee of S<sup>r</sup> William Lockarts returne for England, I will presume hee will give a better account of the King of France his progresse than they that are here can pretend to receive any other way; however I would not omit to send your L<sup>dp</sup> the newes I got here transcribed out of a letter to M<sup>r</sup> Le Duc de Bethune: enquiring from what hand it came, they tell mee it is from a considerable officer in the Army, so that I can say nothing to recommend it particularly to your beleefe, but send you the very paper as it was extracted for me and leave it to you to iudge of the weight of it. I leave this with the best directions I can give that it may bee sent by the first opportunity, and in the mean time have nothing to adde to the assurance of my being  
my L<sup>d</sup>

Your L<sup>dp</sup>s most humble and obedient servant,

HALIFAX.

Calais 29 June S.N. at two of clock in the afternoon.

EARL OF ARLINGTON

The travellers, hastening along the coast, reached Nieuport on the following day.<sup>1</sup> The Bruges boat was passing through the town, and Halifax, anxious to avoid delay, went on at once.<sup>2</sup> Upon his arrival at Bruges, however, he was detained four days, awaiting such a pass from the authorities of Zeeland as might enable him to cross the frontier. During this enforced detention he seems to have addressed to Lord Arlington two separate despatches. Of the first, unfortunately, only one extract is available:—<sup>3</sup>

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Arlington.*

(Bruges, 3d July, 1672.)

It is almost certain that at the rate the King of France now goeth, while I am making a circuit to find him, the country will be gone. The French are within two or three leagues of Amsterdam, which, although it hath drowned the country about it, yet the multitude of people, want of fresh water, and above all, fear, will hinder them from doing the utmost for defence

The second despatch, which has been recovered entire, tells of the popular revolution which was replacing the energetic young General of the United Provinces in the Stadtholdership enjoyed by his ancestors:—

<sup>1</sup> June 30, *State Papers* (foreign: Flanders), June July 1672, letters from J. Vernon.

<sup>2</sup> Leaving his secretary for half an hour, to communicate to the home authorities the last news from the seat of war.

<sup>3</sup> Mackintosh, *Hist. of Eng. Rev.* p. 322 note; from the *Downshire MSS.* (apparently a copy letter-book, see *ibid.* p. 323 note). See also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iii. 43, for copy letter-book of this embassy (*Derenshire MSS.* at Hardwicke).

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Arlington.*

My Lord<sup>1</sup>—Since I writt my last by Mr. Howard, the 1672  
 Messenger I sent into Zeland is come back with a passeport  
 from the States there, who have sent to the States Generall for  
 another to meet mee. so that I am going this morning to  
 Sluce & from thence to Middelbrough in a yacht they have  
 sent thither to stay for me. I believe it now certaine, That  
 the Prince of Orange is declared Stadthouder<sup>2</sup> at Amsterdam,  
 Rotterdam Dort,<sup>3</sup> & Haerlem, & the Messenger I sent into  
 Zeland saw it done whilest he stayed for my passeport. I am  
 told that de Witt who came sick from the Fleet to Dort was  
 forced by the people to sign to the making the Prince Stadt-  
 houder. One of the men that hurt de Witt<sup>4</sup> is beheaded in  
 the prison att the Hague. They appear to be very resolute in  
 Zeland. The Burgers of all the Townes having sworn to  
 defend themselves to the last & to part with all money they  
 have to the State, if it bee necessary. But I suppose if Our  
 Fleet cometh out and hath the success We may reasonably  
 hope, it may make them dispense with their rash Oaths. They  
 have taken some men from their Fleet to putt into their garri-  
 sons hereabouts which shews they do not intend to engage with  
 Us at Sea. I hear now that they are a good deal recovered  
 from their fears att Amsterdam relying upon the water they  
 have lett in to secure them. The particulars of Ardenburg and  
 Zutphen I send as I received them in print from Zeland. A  
 Regiment of foot came today to this place in very great hast.  
 If their buisness should bee anything more than ordinary, it  
 must bee knowne in a few days. If I meet anything in Zeland  
 worth acquainting yo<sup>r</sup> L<sup>thp</sup> with I shall send from thence to  
 you. In the mean time I am

My L<sup>d</sup>

Yo<sup>r</sup> L<sup>thp</sup> most humble and obedient servant

HALIFAX.

Bruges 4th July 1672.

Meanwhile a startling revolution of policy was taking place in England which virtually superseded the embassy of Lord Halifax.

For several reasons the attachment of Buckingham to the French alliance had cooled. Undoubtedly he had been greatly mortified by the policy which had sub-

<sup>1</sup> This letter is not among the *State Papers* at the Record Office; it is with the papers of John Ellis (of the Secretary of State's office). Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 28,896, f. 5. Handwriting of Vernon (?), autograph signature of Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> The Prince was declared Stadtholder of Holland and West Friesland this very day, July 4 (*Groen van Prinsterer, Archives*, 2nd series, v. 259).

<sup>3</sup> The first of the towns to move in the matter (Ralph, i. 206, June <sup>20</sup>/<sub>30</sub>).

<sup>4</sup> The life of Cornelius de Wit had been attempted June 11 (x.s.?). (See Ralph, i. 206.)

1672 stituted the young Duke of Monmouth for himself in the command of the English contingent. Moreover, he could not be ignorant of a very general impression—an impression shared by Sidney Godolphin, English representative at the French Court<sup>1</sup>—that Louis in the flush of success, fearful lest the acquisition of Zealand might enable us to thwart his further designs on the Spanish Low Countries, intended to sacrifice our interests to his ambition, and to play a separate game. It seems certain, moreover, that even Buckingham's temerity had become alarmed by the daring policy of the Dover Treaty, into which he had obtained some insight;<sup>2</sup> whilst his vanity was flattered by private overtures from the Dutch.<sup>3</sup> Within a week of Lord Halifax's departure the Duke became anxious to secure for this country, in defiance of France, her due portion of the booty. He seems to have supposed that this object might be best attained by peace negotiations, in the course of which England and the States, being either concerned to stay the overwhelming progress of the French arms, might to a certain extent afford a mutual assistance.

The overtures of the States to the two Courts had brought the question of a negotiation within the sphere of practical politics, and Louis now requested that, in view of a possibly impending conference, plenipotentiary powers should be conferred upon Mr. Godolphin. Buckingham hereupon urged that he should himself be despatched on a special mission for this purpose, and Charles (desirous, as he told the French Ambassador, to silence the Duke's importunity<sup>4</sup>) agreed to the project. In order, however, to modify this sudden and rather unwelcome ardour, Charles was compelled to include Lord Arlington in the letters of credit, a proceeding the more extraordinary as his absence would leave the country without the services of a Secretary of State.<sup>5</sup> On June 20 the two Ambassadors-designate, with Lords Shaftesbury and Clifford, the remaining members of the Cabal or confidential Ministry, held a preliminary conference<sup>6</sup> with those Dutch deputies who, as mentioned in the instructions of Lord Halifax, had been relegated to Hampton Court. The object of this conference was evidently to

<sup>1</sup> Godolphin, letter of June 15, Record Office *State Papers* (French), 292.

<sup>2</sup> Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 86.

<sup>3</sup> See the paper mentioned on page 30, note 1, also Mignet, iv. 45.

<sup>4</sup> Christie, ii. 85 (from Colbert's despatch of June 30).

<sup>5</sup> Henry Coventry had not then arrived from Sweden.

<sup>6</sup> *London Gazette*, No. 688.

pave the way for a possible co-operation between the two Powers whose interests, though in so infinitely differing degrees, were opposed to the absolute triumph of French ambition. The instructions of the Dutchmen, however, who had been despatched with an undignified haste which paints the terror of the States, only enabled them to ascertain the sentiments of the English Court, without capacitating them for making any specific proposals on the part of the States. Buckingham none the less, by reiterated questions, elicited a private expression of opinion from the deputies.<sup>1</sup> They considered that their principals would be ready to secure the friendship of England by conceding the honour of the Flag, and by a renewal of the Triple Alliance. With regard to the question of a war indemnity, the envoys, in the exhausted state of national finances, preferred to reserve their opinion. Hints, however, were let fall, suggesting that the intervention of England as a mediator between the States and France might be acceptable, though the deputies discreetly added that they were strangers as to the exact relations which had existed or did exist between the two Crowns. In reporting the terms of the interview to the States the envoys derived some consolation from the obvious unpopularity of the French successes. 'The Lord Duke of Buckingham,' runs the despatch, 'himself confesses that the business has passed out of their hands, and that they would be very unwilling to see France in possession of our entire territory; and as far as it appears, the Mission is designed for no other end save to try whether they can procure the voluntary concession of England's share, since they are here in no condition to obtain, in despite of France, what was agreed upon as to the portion of England.' On the following day instructions issued for the impending embassy: we print such extracts as are of importance in the present connection.<sup>2</sup>

It would appear from a paper which we shall give later on that the instructions were drawn up by Charles's express directions at a meeting of the Ministers on board the 'Prince.'

<sup>1</sup> The *Dutch Despatches*, British Museum transcripts, Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. BB, despatch of June 30, f. 184.

<sup>2</sup> From one of several copies in the Record Office, among which no doubt is the original. There is said to be another copy in the Bodleian. This date is June 21. Buckingham and Arlington are described as 'Our Embassadors Extraordinary to the most Christian King, and Plenipotentiaries to treat and conclude a Peace with the States General or any other Princes & States concerned in y<sup>e</sup> present Warre' (*State Papers* [foreign: French], 282, f. 280).

1672 The Ambassadors are directed, on reaching the territory of the States, to give them notice of their arrival

. . . and that your businesse is to goe to y<sup>e</sup> most Chtian King & then jointly with his Commissioners to treat with the said States for Satisfaction & accomodateing all differences. And you may desire their Salve Conduct through their Countreyes.

When you are come to y<sup>e</sup> most Chtian King you shall acquaint him with the Occasion of Our sending you to him, and that it chiefly arose from his Letter to his Embassadour here with us, desiring y<sup>t</sup> Powers might be sent to Mr. Godolphin to treat & conclude, and you shall acquaint him y<sup>e</sup> most Chtian King, y<sup>t</sup> we think the affaire of so much importance that we thought it proper to send you of our inmost Councils, & of most Confidence with Us & on whom he might also rely upon.

If you find y<sup>e</sup> Lord Viscount Halifax there, you shall acquaint him with all your Instructions, and let him know that he is in joint Commission with you, and y<sup>t</sup> he act accordingly.

You shall acquaint y<sup>e</sup> most Chtian King, y<sup>t</sup> we cannot consent to a Peace untill we have some effect of y<sup>e</sup> Warre, viz. y<sup>e</sup> Places agreed upon between Us for Our division, or Conditions that may be in some sort equivalent to it.

And if you shall with the most Chtian King's Commissioners jointly conclude a Peace with y<sup>e</sup> States General, you shall insist upon & procure these following Conditions,<sup>1</sup>

The Owning y<sup>e</sup> Right of Our Flag, & Our Dominion in y<sup>e</sup> British Seas and y<sup>e</sup> Payment of an yearly Summe of Money<sup>2</sup> for ever, for permitting y<sup>e</sup> Subjects of y<sup>e</sup> States General to fish in them.

You shall also procure a Summe of Money<sup>3</sup> towards y<sup>e</sup> Expences y<sup>t</sup> We have been at in this Warre, y<sup>e</sup> greater part<sup>1</sup> of wh<sup>ch</sup> to be paid in October next.<sup>2</sup>

You shall procure 3 or 4 Cautionary<sup>6</sup> Townes to be for ever in Our possession as Flushing Sluce, y<sup>e</sup> Brill, or some

<sup>1</sup> A few paragraphs on, reference is made to a 'Project' of the Duke of Buckingham, by which the Ambassadors were to be guided. With regard to this paper some difficulties arise: (A) in the Record Office *State Papers* (foreign: Holland) 268, f. 27 is a manuscript entitled: 'My Lord of Bucks his paper as it is called y<sup>t</sup> is w<sup>ch</sup> was pretended to be sent from y<sup>e</sup> States deputies at Lond. to his Grace by Mr. Howard' (probably Thomas, afterwards notorious as Lord Howard of Eserick), being 'A project for Termes with the States' (i.e. for a separate peace between England and the United Provinces). But (B) at the conference with the Dutch deputies already described Buckingham had mentioned another project, of which the deputies had obtained a copy some days previously, and which they transmitted to their principals; this contains two additional articles (*Dutch Despatches*, as on p. 79, note 1).

<sup>2</sup> The paper (A) suggests 100,000*l.* per annum.

<sup>3</sup> The paper (A) proposes 500,000*l.* <sup>4</sup> The paper (A) suggests 300,000*l.*

<sup>5</sup> And the rest within a year (*ibid.*).

<sup>6</sup> This expression was probably selected because Queen Elizabeth had once held the Brill, Flushing, and Ramekens as cautionary towns for the repayment of sums advanced by her (*Temple's Works*, 1770, ii. 110).

others, and a sufficient yearly Summe to be paid Us by y<sup>e</sup> Townes & Country for y<sup>e</sup> maintaining y<sup>e</sup> Garrisons We shall putt into them. 1672

You shall make y<sup>e</sup> best Conditions you can for our Nephew y<sup>e</sup> Prince of Orange by making him Prince (if possible) of Holland and as much of y<sup>e</sup> other Countreyes as you can<sup>1</sup> or at least y<sup>t</sup> he, and y<sup>e</sup> Heires Males of his Body be for ever Stadtholders, Generals & Admirals.

You shall procure an adjustment of Trade in y<sup>e</sup> East Indies, as we have desired formerly.<sup>2</sup> You shall procure, that Right be don us in y<sup>e</sup> business of Surinam.<sup>2</sup> And upon most of these Heads you shall have reference to y<sup>e</sup> Project given to y<sup>e</sup> Duke of Buckingham . . .<sup>3</sup>

in passing through their Country you may use what endeavours you think fitt, that any of their Townes & Places may declare for Us, And if y<sup>e</sup> Isle of Walcheren will declare for Us, you may give your Protections for their East India Fleet to come in there.<sup>4</sup>

In case you find you cannot conclude a Peace upon these or y<sup>e</sup> like Conditions, you shall make what hast you can to returne to Us, and y<sup>e</sup> yachts y<sup>t</sup> carry you shall accordingly attend you.<sup>5</sup>

But though you doe not conclude a Peace with the States General, yet you shall make Conditions with his most Chistian Ma<sup>ty</sup> for our Nephew y<sup>e</sup> Pr. of Orange, as Our Treaty with the said King doth allow, and if it be possible you shall procure for him y<sup>e</sup> Places y<sup>t</sup> shall be Conquered in Holland or Zealand (that is not Our Partage)<sup>6</sup> or that shall submit upon owning him their Sovereign, but this must be left to you upon y<sup>e</sup> Place to get y<sup>e</sup> best Conditions you can for him.

On the following day<sup>7</sup> the Ambassadors started.

Meanwhile we must retrace, and follow the movements of the unconscious Lord Halifax. Having been delayed at Bruges, as already stated, until the arrival of a passport from the States of Zealand, the Ambassador left that

<sup>1</sup> This part of the condition is omitted in the Paper (A). Paper (B) suggests that the right of appointing Regents in minority shall be reserved to the English Crown.

<sup>2</sup> Omitted in both papers.

<sup>3</sup> (A) further suggests that Charles should mediate between France and Holland, the States accepting his decision; that the Triple League should be maintained with the addition of a league offensive and defensive between England and Holland. (B) further suggests that France shall retain as much of Brabant, Guelderland, and Overysse as shall be in her hands June 20.

<sup>4</sup> Powers to this effect, dated June 21, are among *State Papers* (Holland), June.

<sup>5</sup> I.e. wait for you.

<sup>6</sup> I.e. except the proposed cautionary towns.

<sup>7</sup> June 22, *London Gazette*, No. 688. Credentials empowering the young Duke of Monmouth to act with them, though dated the 22nd, were despatched by special messenger.



1672 place on the 24th, and reached Sluys, at noon, where he was received by the civic authorities, under orders from the States, with military honours and other distinguished civilities. An East India Company's yacht seems to have been placed at his disposal, to which, as the tide proved unpropitious, the servants and luggage were relegated. The Ambassador himself hastened meanwhile to Cadzand, whence a sea passage of an English mile brought him about six o'clock in the afternoon to Flushing in Walcheren.

'We walked,' says his secretary,<sup>1</sup> 'through the Towne followed by an infinite number of people.' A few hours more found them at Middelburg, in the centre of the island.<sup>2</sup> The people appeared modest and civil. 'I saw,' writes the secretary, 'severall women shed tears and wring their hands as Wee passed by.'

From Middelburg on the following day Lord Halifax despatched a letter to Lord Arlington, little dreaming that at the same moment the secretary and his colleague were themselves informing Lord Clifford, on whom the secretarial duties devolved, of their own arrival at The Hague.

The remarkably independent line taken by the newly initiated diplomatist will be best realised by comparing this letter with his instructions :—

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Arlington.*

My L<sup>d</sup>,<sup>3</sup>—In my way hither yesterday, a Yaucht met mee at Sluce, where I was by order of the States receaved very civilly; there came with it a Gentleman from the States Generall with their passeport,<sup>4</sup> and an order for him to go along with mee whilst I stay in their territories. I go away from hence this afternoon, and in the mean time what I have observed in this little time, is an extream aversion in this people of Zealand to the French :<sup>5</sup> your L<sup>th</sup> will beleieve they are not very fond of us at this time, yet the Burgers here<sup>6</sup> have amongst other articles resolved, that in case of extremity, they will give themselves up to the English : how that extremity will bee defined, or how farre it may be in their power to keep their resolution, if they let the danger come

<sup>1</sup> Vernon to Williamson (?), June <sup>15</sup>/<sub>July 5</sub>, *Stat. Pap.* (foreign : Holland), July 1672, 269, f. 31.

<sup>2</sup> The Ambassador lodged at the 'Ville de Domberg,' in the Market Place. Middelburg seems to have been considered the chief town in Zealand (*Hist. Will.*, Intro., p. v).

<sup>3</sup> June <sup>25</sup>/<sub>July 5</sub>, *State Papers* (foreign : Holland), June 1672, bundle 267, f. 204. An abstract of part, in form of a quotation, will be found in Mackintosh, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, p. 322 note.

<sup>4</sup> Procured by the States of Zealand.

<sup>5</sup> For their opposition to the negotiations, see Mignet, iv. 29.

<sup>6</sup> At Middelburg. (See appendix to this chapter.)

too near them is a question I cannot determine: that which 1672  
recommendeth us to them, is their greater hatred to the French,  
and the consideration of preserving their Religion, they being  
here very Zealous Protestants, and universally so, without any  
mixture of Roman Catholics. I could wish in this and other  
respects, that if anything should be attempted upon this Island,<sup>1</sup>  
it might be done by English alone; for in a good commixture,  
half force and half treaty, the K<sup>t</sup> businesse might perhaps bee  
better done by a small number of his own subiects, than by a  
greater force half made up of French, to whom the aversion is  
so great, that it would make them desperate, and deaf to any  
treaty; whether this is to bee practised or no, your L<sup>dy</sup> best  
knoweth, I onely offer it to your thoughts, which I hope you will  
forgive mee. The Prince of Oranges colours flourish every where  
in this place, and the people are much pleased with it. hee is  
chosen Stadtholder of Amsterdam and Delft, and other places  
in Holland, in many of them it was done by a kind of violence  
of the people upon the Magistrates. Hee is now between  
Utrecht and Leyden, but I do not hear hee hath any consider-  
able force with him. This morning fower of the States here<sup>2</sup>  
gave mee a visitt, amongst them M<sup>r</sup> Odyke who is just come back  
from his deputation<sup>3</sup> to the most Christian King. The account  
hee gave mee which was, before the rest of the States, is that the  
King never saw them, but referred them to Mr: Pomponne and  
M<sup>r</sup> de Louvois who at first told them nothing could bee treated  
upon, till our Master was first consulted but afterwards proposed  
the articles I now send to your L<sup>dy</sup>, which are printed here; <sup>4</sup>  
that upon the deputies asking him, what satisfaction the King  
of England would expect, hee told him, each party was to keep  
what they had gott, that the English were not in a condition  
to make such demands as his master, and that they would look  
onely to the businesse of the Flagge, and the fishing; <sup>5</sup> this, I  
relate as I heard it from the Authour, thinking it my duty not  
to omitt to let your L<sup>dy</sup> know it. when I am at my journey's  
end, I shall presently see whether there is any mistake in this  
intelligence. the states said much of their ill condition, lament-  
ing the warre they have with England & wishing the King

<sup>1</sup> Walcheen.

<sup>2</sup> Of Zealand.

<sup>3</sup> The deputation of June 22. It had consisted of Messrs. de Gaud, de Groot, d'Odyke, and Eich. Louis had imperiously dismissed M. de Groot to obtain a Plenipotentiary Commission. He returned with powers informally granted June 23. The insolent terms proposed by Louis caused the deputies to demand a pause of five days. De Groot again retired to consult the States; d'Odyke accompanied him, and, finding Zealand disavowed the negotiation, left the Commission, June 29 (Mignet, iv. 21, 22, 27-36).

<sup>4</sup> We have not identified this paper. Mignet gives the articles from the despatch of Louis. There is a copy in the Record Office obtained through Van Beuning.

<sup>5</sup> His secretary had mentioned a similar report, adding 'but this looks like a trick to make a disunion.' Pomponne told Godolphin that his master had specially stipulated for the satisfaction of the King of England.

1672 would interpose.<sup>1</sup> I kept myselfe the best I could within the rules prescribed to mee, putting them in mind I was a private person here, and in that capacity I told them the King had no fixed resolution to ruine their country,<sup>2</sup> but onely to do himselfe right and that whenever they found themselves in the disposition of proposing anything to his Maiesty I did not doubt but they would find him inclined to all reasonable things that might consist with his honour. It would bee too long to tell your L<sup>dy</sup> all our discourse, but wee parted very kindly. one thing I must not forget they said, which was that if the King of England should now ingage with their fleet, the advantage of his victory would go wholly to the French, since the effect of it would bee that all the countries would the sooner yield to him, when they have no hopes<sup>3</sup> at sea left to support them. I intend to go from hence towards Utrecht this afternoon, being told the King of France is there or neer it. they please themselves here with the report of an Army coming out of Germany to their rescue. their fleet lyeth so neer Flushing that I saw it as I came from Sluce. I am, my L<sup>d</sup>

Your L<sup>dy</sup>s most humble and obedient servant

HALIFAX.

Middleburgh, 5. July<sup>1</sup> s.n. 72.

This letter, as we have already observed, coincides in date with a despatch which the intended recipient, whom Lord Halifax naturally conceived as at Whitehall, was directing from The Hague to a Ministerial colleague in England. That document,<sup>4</sup> with a letter from Buckingham, by which it was accompanied, describes vividly enough the intense excitement prevailing at 'Mazeland Sluce,' at 'The Brill,' and at The Hague itself, where on the very day of their arrival the populace of the city, following the example of Zealand, had forced upon the magistrates the elevation of the Prince of Orange to the Stadtholdership. The civic authorities seemed paralysed with terror; the enthusiasm of the multitude was even enhanced by the arrival of the Embassy, 'believing us partiall to him, and that wee came to make peace;' while excited crowds, much exhilarated by drinking health to the Prince and confusion to the States, escorted the envoys to their lodgings.<sup>5</sup> To the Ambassadors the

<sup>1</sup> I.e. mediate as proposed by the envoys sent from the States to England.

<sup>2</sup> Here he directly contradicts his instructions. (See *supra*.)

<sup>3</sup> This word is not clear, and may be read 'hopes' or 'forces.'

<sup>4</sup> June 25  
July 5.

<sup>5</sup> *State Papers* (foreign: Holland), June 1672, bundle 267, f. 101. Mignet gives an extract.

<sup>6</sup> 'In short,' says Buckingham, 'what I have seene heere can bee compared to nothing but the burning of the Rump.'

revolution appeared a triumph for English interests. The political annihilation of the Batavian Republic they regarded as an accomplished fact; it rested with the young Stadtholder so to arrange as that the ruin of his country should not involve his own. Closely connected as he was by birth with the English reigning house, he could, they argued, find his individual account only in identifying his own cause and that of England. Let him extort from his fellow-countrymen through the influence accruing to his new position the territorial propitiation<sup>1</sup> of the English Court; in return for these concessions the powerful co-operation of Charles must secure to the Prince, by the terms of the contemplated pacification, his full share of personal advantage. Full of these projects, the Plenipotentiaries lavished civilities upon the magnates of The Hague,<sup>2</sup> and announced their intention of halting, on their way to the French camp, at the Leaguer of the new Stadtholder. The Embassy, accompanied by the celebrated Van Beuning of Amsterdam, reached the Prince's camp on the evening of <sup>June 25</sup> July 5.

He had posted himself 'At a certain place called Newerbrugge, a league and a halfe beyond Worden, being a Passe upon the old Rhyne.'<sup>3</sup> The Ambassadors were duly received by the youthful Stadtholder, and their account<sup>4</sup> of the interview is interesting in the extreme: 'Wee . . . lost no time in endeavouring to ease his mind from the reproaches he made us upon the subject of the Warr, by letting him know in confidence to himself his Ma<sup>ty</sup> would not be brought to begin it till he had conditioned the Prince should find his account in it & in case of success, of w<sup>ch</sup> wee did not doubt.' The Prince, however, had refused to discuss the situation from this point of view. Brandenburg, he pointed out, had promised assistance, which, with the reinforcement assured by Spain and 15,000 men expected on the part of the Emperor, would suffice to turn the scale; 'but that,' we are told,

<sup>1</sup> They had received from Van Beuning the report, mentioned by Halifax, that France had abandoned her ally.

<sup>2</sup> See Temple, Burnet, and Kennet (iii. 289); this last account, however, which is merely given from report, may be exaggerated.

<sup>3</sup> *London Gazette*, No. 693.

<sup>4</sup> Which occurs in a very remarkable despatch dated 'From the Camp near Utrecht, June ye 28th, 1672' (<sup>June 28</sup> July 8). The original, partly in cipher deciphered (here indicated by italics), is in the Record Office *Stat. Pap.* (foreign: Holland), June 1672, bundle 267, f. 121, erroneously endorsed <sup>25</sup> June. A copy among the papers of Henry Coventry at Longleat (bundle 56) marks his entry into the duties of his office; he took the oath July 11, (*London Gazette*, No. 690).

1672 'w<sup>h</sup> they relyed most upon was, that 'they' could not beleive the King our master could find his advantage in seeing them totally over runne by the French, *and he explained to us, that his power to treat with us was upon termes that might separate us from France by a conjunction with them, softening by easier termes, that wee should oblige France to give them Peace : exclaiming against the exorbitance of their demands, . . .* (he) concluding they would dy a thousand deaths rather then submit to them ; wee replyed wee would doe our best to moderate them, *soe wee might finde our accomp in the adiustment, and to make our termes goe down the more wee called it Cautionary Townes for the performance of what should bee promised us ; to w<sup>h</sup> the Prince replyed, hee was confident the States would never give them ; and that for his owne part he could not in conscience advise them to it ;* wee desired him to bethink himselfe well not only to remove the warre out of his country *but to establish to himselfe a Sovereignty over it, wherein both the Kings would secure him from abroad, and at home from all danger ;* Hee replied, *he liked better the condition of Stadtholder w<sup>h</sup> they had given him, and y<sup>e</sup> he beleived himselfe obliged in conscience and honor not to prefer his interest before his obligation.*' The Ambassadors desired him to consult his most trusted advisers, and apprehending that he would select Van Beuning, who, as we have said, had accompanied them from The Hague, and Beverning, '*Wee gave him,*' they intimated, '*the caution of concealing from them the point of Sovereignty, w<sup>h</sup> wee are perswaded he did observe.*' After supper, in fact, these gentlemen were admitted to a conference, when Van Beuning 'according to his usuall way' enlarged upon the advantages which a peace would secure to England, 'with a multitude of arguments drawne from morality and conscience w<sup>ch</sup> tooke up a great deale of time.'<sup>1</sup> It would appear, however, that these arguments had more effect than the despatch allows. The Prince afterwards told Burnet that he had himself dilated upon the impolicy of the Anglo-French alliance until the Duke of Buckingham, exclaiming with his accustomed oath that William 'was in the right,' had offered to sign, upon the spot, a treaty between England and the States. Arlington had seemed thunderstruck at the rashness of his colleague ; but the

<sup>1</sup> This touch is delightfully characteristic of the writers. Oddly enough, Burnet compares Van Beuning to Buckingham, as a witty and agreeable conversationalist. In other respects they differed widely, since Van Beuning was a man of high character and rather fanatically devout.

Prince, uncertain as to their instructions, had ordered 1672 articles to be engrossed, and believed that, could they have been framed that evening, Buckingham would have signed them. Night, however, brought counsel, and Buckingham recoiled. The next morning, moreover (we revert to the despatch), found the Dutchmen still determined upon maintaining the integrity of the national territory, and the Prince still proof to the temptations of personal advantage; though the young men around him murmured they would lief a dozen of the States were hanged '*soe ye country had Peace, and the Prince were Sovereign of it.*' Before the Embassy left, the Prince consulted the envoys as to the advisability of opening an informal correspondence with his uncle on occasion of his own advancement to the Stadtholdership; and he concluded with a final appeal to the Ambassadors themselves, which was very coldly received. Burnet records that Buckingham departed with an augury of despair, to which the Prince retorted that rather than connive at the catastrophe he would die in the last ditch. The attempt to seduce him had proved a failure; and the Ambassadors, profoundly mortified by his refusal, could only rely in future on the complaisance of France.

On the evening of the 26th<sup>1</sup> the Ambassadors reached Utrecht. Their reception<sup>2</sup> at the French King's quarters a mile and a half distant took place the following morning.<sup>3</sup> Louis then accorded the Ambassadors a private interview in the presence of Louvois and Pomponne alone and 'made . . . many professions of his resolution not to give . . . over till the King our master were entirely satisfied.'

These civilities afforded an agreeable contrast to the rigidity of the Prince of Orange, and the Ambassadors were proportionally charmed. 'In all the discourses wee have had w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> King,' so they wrote home, his promises had been such 'y<sup>t</sup> it should bee impossible . . . to distrust the performance.'

Meanwhile Lord Halifax, who had been delayed two days by contrary winds on his passage from Zealand to Rotterdam,<sup>4</sup> reached the Prince's camp this same day;<sup>5</sup> only to learn, if he had not done so before, that the

<sup>1</sup> June 26.

July 6.

<sup>2</sup> The credential letters are in the Bodleian, Rawlinson C. 172 (149).

<sup>3</sup> June 27.

July 7.

<sup>4</sup> Williamson, Record Office *State Papers* (foreign: Holland), June 29 (267, f. 232).

<sup>5</sup> June 27.

July 7.

1672 principal Secretary of State and the Master of the Horse had preceded him in quality of Plenipotentiaries. He at once notified his arrival to Lord Arlington :—<sup>1</sup>

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Arlington.*

My L<sup>d</sup>—It was no small surprise to mee to hear your L<sup>dp</sup> was at Utrecht before mee, though I shall be able to iustify myselfe to you, that I could not possibly prevent the delays I have met with by the way. I send this to know exactly where I may find your L<sup>dp</sup>, that the first thing I do may bee to wait upon you and receive your commands. The Prince lets mee have a trumpet to send to you upon this occasion, and I hope hee will returne from your L<sup>dp</sup> so as to meet mee upon the way.

I am

My L<sup>d</sup>

Your L<sup>dp</sup>'s most humble and obedient servant

HALIFAX

from the Prince of Orange's camp Thursday 8 July 72.<sup>2</sup>

He reached Utrecht the same evening,<sup>3</sup> but his formal audience was deferred two days; nor was he admitted to the important conference which on the morning that followed his arrival took place in a room adjoining the King's bedchamber.<sup>4</sup> There were present on the one side Arlington, Buckingham, and the young Duke of Monmouth; on the other Pomponne and Louvois, and the discussion lasted from nine o'clock till noon.

The Frenchmen implied that their master intended to insist on his demands, which he considered extremely reasonable,<sup>5</sup> and they advised the envoys, in expectation of resumed negotiations, to formulate the demands of Charles, 'without the grant of w<sup>ch</sup> his Ma<sup>ty</sup> would not be satisfied.'

The Ambassadors inquired point blank whether Louis desired peace or no; the Ministers evaded an answer

*by desiring to know the King our master's mind; thereupon wee told them, that after soe much expence and expectation from the people, he could not well end the warr, without reaping the benefit he had proposed to himselfe in it, the possession of what was specified in the Treaty.*

<sup>1</sup> Lord Halifax to Lord Arlington, *Stat. Pap.* (foreign: Holland), July 1672, bundle 269, f. 63, addressed 'Present this To the right Hon<sup>ble</sup> the Earle of Arlington.'

<sup>2</sup> Accidentally misdated. The *Gazette* (No. 393) shows he arrived Thursday, July 7.

<sup>3</sup> June 27.  
July 7.

<sup>4</sup> June 28.  
July 8.

<sup>5</sup> 'In respect of what he might reasonably expect to conquer, having soe much of the yeare still before him.'

The French<sup>9</sup> Ministers then practically admitted (and later in the day, during private conversation, they repeated the admission) that Louis was anxious for peace, if obtainable upon his own terms, and that he believed the Dutch would concede them. *'Wherefore,'* so the Ambassadors continue, *'they seemed willing to examine with us the probability of obtaining ours. They told us, their opinion, how hardly the States would consent to ye dismembring those parts of Zealand from the rest of the Provinces; wherefore on both sides wee agreed, y<sup>t</sup> the onely way of bringing them to this point would bee to make our demandes consist of a summe of money; to bee paid at large termes; Tribute for the Fisheries; ships of Warr, advantages in the East India Trade, restitution of the King's subjects from Surinam, the honour of ye Flagg, in a word, such things as might not on the one side totally rebute them, and throwe them into a despaire, and yet on the other side, necessitate their giving us cautionarily, and by way of security for their performance, places; w<sup>ch</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> [by] the Treaty wee are to bee content. To w<sup>ch</sup> wee are to adde as a private overture to the Prince of Orange that of making him sovereign of all the Seaven Provinces, our partage only excepted; of w<sup>ch</sup> he shall covenant to us, to give his Ma<sup>ty</sup> entier possession when the former point is made good to him. And his most Xtian Ma<sup>ty</sup> to bee his and our Garantie therein.'*

On the evening of this eventful day the important despatch from which we have hitherto quoted<sup>1</sup> was written. It is signed by Arlington and the two Dukes alone, and contains a significant passage:—

. . . my L<sup>d</sup> Halifax here arrived last night, and will have his Audience tomorrowe, wherein having performed his compliment of ye birth of Mon<sup>r</sup> d'Auion, he will referr himselfe in the other poynts of his Instructions to what hath been said by us: his L<sup>d</sup> is acquainted w<sup>th</sup> this whole despatch, and shall bee so with ye whole progresse of our negociation.

The final sentence appears decidedly pregnant. It is obvious that to acquaint a colleague with the progress of a negotiation and to concede him a substantial share in

<sup>1</sup> It is extremely long, and contains other valuable passages; as a renewed urgency, fortified by the later intelligence of Lord Halifax, for the attack on Zealand; the expression of a hope that the Prince of Orange may be induced to concur; the recommendation of an attempt on the Dutch East India fleet; an intimation of fear on the part of France, lest the assistance afforded to the States from the Netherlands might involve an open breach with Spain, which Buckingham and Arlington hoped to avert by expostulating with Monterey (the Governor) on their return journey.



1672 the decision are very different things. 'The expression therefore confirms a natural supposition that the two Ministers, conscious of their superior importance and deeply involved among intrigues to which the new Privy Councillor was a stranger, desired to nullify as far as possible his Commission. In effect, we find that the secretary when relating the issue of the Embassy entirely ignores the third Ambassador.<sup>1</sup> But Lord Halifax in person was less easily suppressed; it was generally believed that he had assumed from the first a very independent line, and that the relations between himself and his colleagues reached a stage of some asperity. Their differences, we should presume, related to that definition of the English demands which was to be inserted in the contemplated ultimatum, since this was the point at issue when he first entered upon the responsibilities of the Plenipotentiary Commission; and the singularly incorrect statement of Burnet that '*to give the Nation some satisfaction* Lord Halifax was sent over *afterwards*'<sup>2</sup> proves at least that his influence was supposed to have been exerted in favour of a policy really patriotic. Nor is it difficult to divine *à priori* the probable trend of his exertions. The one object of the *Ministers*, as we have already seen, was to secure for the country a substantial share of the Dutch spoil, such as might reconcile the nation to an alliance essentially unpopular, and divert from themselves a measure of odium which they saw to be inherently menacing. To Lord Halifax, on the other hand--an enthusiastic eulogist of the Triple Alliance, a professed enemy of the Anglo-French understanding---the political aspects of the situation must, as one conjectures, have naturally appealed. Anxious to withdraw his country at almost any cost from a dangerous and impolitic war and a disastrous amity, and far from desiring the territorial aggrandisement of England at the expense of the exhausted Republic, he would presumably aim at a conciliatory and purely honorary scale of demands, such as might facilitate an arrangement between the belligerents and lay the foundation for a renewed friendship. How far these designs (which may have derived additional emphasis from an interview with the Prince of Orange) were compatible with the instructions of the Plenipotentiaries our readers may judge, but that

<sup>1</sup> Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 378, July 25.

<sup>2</sup> 'But,' he added, i. p. 596, 'he was not in the secret.' Mignet, on the other hand, erroneously states that Halifax preceded the Ministers at Utrecht.

they were in substance avowed by Lord Halifax may be gathered from the evidence which we submit. 1672

1. During the following year there appeared a very able attack on the French Alliance.<sup>1</sup>

• It would seem to be the work of a well-informed politician; but since it is anonymous we cannot, of course, gauge with any approach to accuracy the value of its allegations. It has been ascribed to Sir William Coventry an identification which, appropriate as it would appear for our purpose, we must accept with reserve. The writer's political views tally indeed to a very great extent with the opinions expressed by Coventry in the House of Commons; but the tone is remarkable for a vehemence, a directness of personal invective, which are not characteristic of Sir William. The writer directly insinuates that upon the question of terms Lord Halifax dissented from his colleagues, whom he charges with pecuniary corruption. He challenges the Duke and Arlington to answer eight queries.<sup>2</sup> Of these the fourth investigates 'How far those that were joyned in Commission with them did concur with them in their Judgment . . . ?' and whether the dangers of endorsing and accentuating the French demands, with the importance of the advances made by the Prince of Orange and the Dutch, as well as many other considerations, 'were not represented to them; And urged by some who had no other end but to serve their Master faithfully.' The fifth article suggests this as the 'Reason they opposed so fiercely, My Lord Vicount Hallifax (who came a day or two after them) his appearing and acting joyntly with them, though Commissionated in as full and as ample a manner as themselves;' and the sixth query roundly demands 'Who were those (after my Lord Hallifax could be kept out no longer) who went privately to the French Camp under several pretences and had still negociations of their own on foot?'<sup>3</sup>

2. The next evidence we shall adduce is that of Buckingham himself, who eighteen months later, in his defence

<sup>1</sup> 'England's Appeal from the Private Cabal at Whitehall to the Great Council of the Nation, the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled. By a true Lover of his Country,' pp. 49, 50. Published in 1673, during the course of which year it ran through five editions (*Bodleian Catalogue*).

<sup>2</sup> Kennet (i. i. 289) prints these queries without reference as the 'Queries of Mr. Secretary Trevor,' an error the more astounding as on the same page he mentions that Trevor had died in May.

<sup>3</sup> 'I have Averred,' he says, 'no one thing without Good vouchers.' We have wondered whether, in case Sir William was not the author of this tract, it should be assigned to Mr. Garraway. (See his speeches in Grey.)

1672 before the House of Commons,<sup>1</sup> approves<sup>2</sup> the exaction of severe terms from the States, and practically takes upon his own shoulders the responsibility for this policy.<sup>2</sup>

3. Lord Arlington is yet more explicit. 'I and Halifax,' he says, 'were for moderate courses, Buckingham for exorbitances.'

4. But the fullest and most conclusive information on this point is contributed by a paper of contemporary notes, *in the handwriting of Williamson, Lord Arlington's secretary*, which may be seen in the Record Office,<sup>3</sup> among the documents relative to this embassy.

It comprises a sketch of the general proceedings, and concludes thus :—

N.B. Some difference of opinion happened among y<sup>e</sup> Amb<sup>r</sup> as to y<sup>e</sup> framing of Condictions on o<sup>r</sup> part, vizt. how high or low to goe in o<sup>r</sup> Dem<sup>nds</sup>.

D(uke) B(uckingham) was for all Zealand, Voorne, Casandt, Sluys &c & in fine as high as y<sup>e</sup> highest that had ev<sup>r</sup> been thought off. as being of y<sup>e</sup> opinion they must & would give it. at least o<sup>r</sup> Nation would expect to have somew<sup>t</sup> by y<sup>e</sup> warre &c.

remember'd not y<sup>e</sup> Instructions made a low<sup>r</sup> degree yet &c.

E. Hallif.(ax) was for a little money & few places &c a Peace would be so happy, so gratefull, so necessary for y<sup>e</sup> Nacon.

remembered not y<sup>e</sup> Instrucons were peremptory in a Peace to have this & this etc.

E. Arlington

was much low<sup>r</sup> then D.B. & yet above L. Hallif.(ax) but w<sup>th</sup>all seem'd to thinke there was latitude enough left in y<sup>e</sup> Instrucons for their L<sup>ds</sup> to vary in some particulars of the Dem<sup>nds</sup> from w<sup>t</sup> seemes peremptorily prescribed in y<sup>e</sup> Second number of y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> Demandes, as they were absolutely ord<sup>d</sup> at a Meeting upon y<sup>e</sup> Prince by y<sup>e</sup> King himselfe w<sup>th</sup> paper to answer y<sup>e</sup> D Bucks who asserted<sup>1</sup> peremptorily y<sup>e</sup> Contrary was produced & read to y<sup>e</sup> Lords. For y<sup>e</sup> D. Bucks alleadged we must have allowed y<sup>e</sup> Lords were bound to demand Zealand

<sup>1</sup> Grey's *Debates*, ii. 263, January 14, 1673.

<sup>2</sup> Questioned by the Speaker as to who were the advisers of 'the second Treaty with the French King at Utrecht, and the Articles thereof?' he answered, 'Lord Arlington and I were sent over to Utrecht . . . the Prince of Orange would have had Peace with France; but what share should we have had? Though he was the King's nephew, yet the King must be kind to his own country. If Peace had been then, we had been in worse condition than we were before: At last the Prince of Orange hoped for a good Peace, but I was not for France to have all, and England nothing. The consequence would have been, Holland must depend on France, if France had conquered near Germany. I think it a wise Article that France should not make Peace without us.' *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Stat. Pap.* (foreign: Holland), June 1672, bundle 267, f. 316.

<sup>4</sup> Or, 'affected.'

&c in sovereignty & perpetual Dominion. Y<sup>e</sup> E. A. on y<sup>e</sup> other hand worded y<sup>e</sup> thing, as to have those places only Cautionary till y<sup>e</sup> money were payd w<sup>ch</sup> was to be stipulated for to rectify both w<sup>ch</sup> mistakes y<sup>t</sup> paper or those notes were produced and did doe it abundantly. 1672

\* N.B. In y<sup>e</sup> framing y<sup>e</sup> Conditions It was pressed to soften them all that could be, especially that of y<sup>e</sup> Townes.

the said L<sup>d</sup> A. &c call them Cautionary onely. But it was at first overlooked that calling them Cautionary for y<sup>e</sup> observation of a perpetual obligation, was to make them Cautionary for ev<sup>t</sup>, i.e. as bad as if to call them in Dominion or Sovereignty, at least as to y<sup>e</sup> durance of o<sup>r</sup> possession of them. And to make them Cautionary onely for y<sup>e</sup> paym<sup>t</sup> of w<sup>t</sup> money should be stipulated for, was

1. to vary from y<sup>e</sup> Instructions

2. to leave y<sup>e</sup> Dutch their own Masters after that time expired and so not doe y<sup>e</sup> King & K<sup>ing</sup> businesse upon them sufficiently. . . .

These statements therefore entirely confirm the conclusion which we might have spontaneously inferred.

Lord Halifax, adequately conscious of the pressing dangers which the insatiate ambition of Louis offered to the equilibrium of Europe, was anxious to minimise as far as might consist with English dignity the demands of this country, and in especial those territorial demands so offensive to the pride and interest of the Dutch. Such forbearance must facilitate peace, throw the onus of continued hostilities on the French, and afford some pretext for loosening the bonds of the Alliance.<sup>1</sup>

But it is by no means strange that Halifax, clear of all responsibility for the war, dared vindicate a policy which the Ministers dared not pursue, saddled as they were with the burden of an initiative such as brilliant success alone could expiate.<sup>2</sup> Nor are we surprised to find that the efforts of the mere Privy Councillor proved unavailing when pitted against Ministerial determination, and that the terms formulated apparently within twenty-four hours of his accession to the business of the Mission were couched in the sense of the majority. They included <sup>3</sup>—

<sup>1</sup> It is worth notice how much the views of Halifax coincided with those of Temple, who (*Works*, ii. 235, memorial of October 1673) lays entire stress on the dignity as opposed to the material advantages to be reaped by England. He never so much as mentions the article of cautionary towns, which was entirely omitted from the treaty eventually signed in February 1673.

<sup>2</sup> The author of the pamphlet quoted above declares that they were further influenced by French gold. It is certain that the French Court had been advised to bribe Buckingham, who was deeply in debt.

<sup>3</sup> Mignet, iv. 48.

1672

1. The honour of the Flag.<sup>1</sup>
2. Satisfaction in Surinam.<sup>1</sup>
3. The extradition of political refugees.
4. £1,000,000<sup>2</sup> for the expenses of the war ; £400,000 being payable by the following October, the remainder in six annual instalments of £100,000.
5. A rent of £100,000 for the herring fishery.
6. The sovereignty of that portion of the United Provinces not demanded by the belligerent monarchs, for the Prince of Orange, in the capacity either of reigning Prince or of hereditary Stadtholder.
7. A treaty of commerce, specially relative to the Indies.
8. The surrender of Sluys, Walcheren, Cadzant, Goree, Voorne as guarantee.<sup>3</sup>

Messengers<sup>4</sup> were promptly despatched to the Prince of Orange empowered to reiterate in the name of France the promise of a sovereignty over the remainder of the United Provinces as a return for his acquiescence in the proposed partition.<sup>5</sup> The credential letter,<sup>6</sup> couched in very peremptory language, is signed by Buckingham, Arlington, and the Duke of Monmouth alone, and warns the Prince that unless the bearers should return shortly with a favourable answer the Embassy will 'be forced to returne home by the way of Flanders to offer his Ma<sup>ty</sup> new meassurs, & farr different.'

The same evening the forces of Louis decamped, and, leaving Luxembourg to block the Prince of Orange, executed, to the general surprise, a rearward movement.

<sup>1</sup> The treaty eventually signed between England and Holland includes the first two articles of this draft, the mutual restoration of conquests, a war indemnity of 200,000*l.*, a compromise in the East Indies, and the confirmation of the Treaty of Breda.

<sup>2</sup> Double that suggested by the articles referred to in the instructions. (See above.)

<sup>3</sup> June 29,  
July 9, Clifford by direction of Charles proposed to the Plenipotentiaries that we should surrender Cadzant and Sluys to the *French*, if that arrangement would facilitate peace. It appears from the answer of the Embassy (Arlington, July  $\frac{10}{17}$  [or  $\frac{7}{17}$ ]) that the French had been anxious for this arrangement, but the Plenipotentiaries had firmly refused, and, considering the importance of holding the approach to Antwerp, they begged Charles would stand firm.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Jermyn and Sir Gabriel Sylvius. The latter, a native of Orange and a man of some ability, had passed from the service of the princely house to that of the Duke of York. He had been sometimes employed in the intrigues between the English Court and the Orange faction; the affair of Bewitt, in especial, might have cost him his life; and at this moment Charles was detaining the Dutch envoys at Hampton Court as hostages for his safety. (See Clarendon, *Life*, iii. 53; also Evelyn, *passim*, and Blenkowe's Sidney, *passim*.)

<sup>5</sup> Letter of Williamson, July  $\frac{5}{15}$ .

<sup>6</sup> *Stat. Pap.* (foreign : Holland), June 1672 (copy).

The Embassy accompanied the army to Rhenen,<sup>1</sup> Arnheim,<sup>2</sup> 1672 and Nimègue.<sup>3</sup> At the last-named place a four days' halt was made. The aspect of the fortifications, shattered by the recent siege,<sup>4</sup> afforded matter of interest, and a magnificent review took place—avowedly in honour of Arlington. Grave was reached on July 14, and here the Embassy encountered the returning messengers.<sup>5</sup> These reported reaching the Prince's camp July 11, where the Stadtholder had greeted them with the intelligence that they arrived twenty-four hours too late. He had taken the oath to the States the preceding day<sup>6</sup> and intended to abide by it. His letter<sup>7</sup> to the Plenipotentiaries is dry in the extreme, and concludes by observing that, being anxious to bring the negotiations to a point, he desires that a note of the joint demands may be forwarded for the consideration of the States.<sup>8</sup>

On the following day<sup>9</sup> the French camp removed to Heeswijk. Here within twenty-four hours the conditions of the two monarchs were officially tabulated. Since, moreover, the French Ministers, upon the insinuation of their representative at St. James's, had conceived some jealousy of a previous understanding between the English and the Dutch, they exacted the signature by the Plenipotentiaries of the two Crowns of a second engagement, in which the provision against separate negotiations is repeated and either Power binds itself against receding from its demands. This document bears the signatures of Pomponne and Louvois on the French part, and on the English side of the four Ambassadors. Lord Halifax is described as 'le s<sup>r</sup> Vicomte d'Halifax' of the Privy Council, and we can well imagine the mortification with which he must have appended his signature.<sup>10</sup> The English Embassy immediately directed a communication to the Prince

<sup>1</sup> July 9.  
<sup>2</sup> July 11.

July 10.

<sup>3</sup> Turenne had taken it four days earlier. It was the one place that had made a good defence.

<sup>4</sup> All this from Williamson's letter dated Grave, July 10, in the Record Office. *State Papers* (Holland), bundle 269, f. 36.

<sup>5</sup> Mignet, iv. 47.

<sup>6</sup> There is a copy (undated) in the Record Office. (See also Mignet, iv. 48.)

<sup>7</sup> July 15.

<sup>8</sup> July 16.

<sup>9</sup> Louis lavished magnificent sums on the customary diplomatic presents. Arlington received jewels to the value of 48,000 *livres tournois*. Buckingham's share was valued at 28,000 *livres tournois*; Monmouth had a diamond ring worth 17,500 *livres tournois*; and a jewelled box with miniature, which became the property of Halifax, was estimated at 10,540 *livres tournois* (Mignet, iv. 49).

1672 of Orange.<sup>1</sup> In the copies at the Record Office, which we presume to be authentic, the signature of Lord Halifax is not indicated. With a direct and somewhat insulting reference to the separate applications of the States, the Ambassadors enclosed a copy of the new compact, intimated that the magnanimity of Louis in repeating his terms was a result of their exertions, and demanded an answer within ten days.

As, however, a speedy response appeared improbable, the Embassy, after consultation with the French Ministers, immediately started (July  $\frac{7}{7}$ ) for England. It returned *via* Brussels and Antwerp, intending to remonstrate with the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands for assistance afforded to the Dutch.<sup>2</sup> Travelling in a royal coach and attended by a guard of honour,<sup>3</sup> the Embassy reached Turnout the same evening and Antwerp about four o'clock on the following afternoon. It was received in state by the magistracy, but the Governor declined to meet the envoys otherwise than in private, and at the interview which took place therefore (July  $\frac{9}{7}$ ) in a Carmelite convent the Spaniard indignantly refused to sacrifice his Dutch allies.<sup>4</sup> Late on the following evening the gentleman who had been despatched to the Prince of Orange unexpectedly overtook the Embassy. A difference of opinion having arisen as to the place where he was to await the Prince's answer, Antwerp had been finally selected as a neutral spot. He reported<sup>5</sup> that the Prince had been much troubled by the despatch and had intimated his anticipation of easier terms, 'with a recommendation to the States of making him sovereign of their Countries.' The messenger had thereupon reminded him

<sup>1</sup> Dated 'Camp à Heeswick ce 6. Juillet 1672,' *Stat. Pap.* (Holl.) 269, f. 54 (i.e.  $\frac{6}{7}$ ), but it is quoted by Mignet, iv. 48, as a letter of  $\frac{7}{7}$ ; it was despatched on that day.

<sup>2</sup> Arlington to Clifford (July  $\frac{7}{7}$ ), dated 'at ye camp betwixt Grave & Bosledue.' (The Record Office copy, *Stat. Pap.* (Holl.) 268, entry book, gives the date July 9, which is obviously erroneous.) There is a brief note from Arlington to the King, July  $\frac{7}{7}$ , referring him to this despatch, but adding that it is impossible to discuss matters fully at a distance.

<sup>3</sup> Arlington describes this as an unprecedented honour; it occasioned, however, some difficulty at Antwerp (despatch of July  $\frac{7}{7}$ , *Stat. Pap.* (Holl.) 269, f. 73).

<sup>4</sup> Despatch of July  $\frac{11}{7}$ , and see Mignet, iv. 52. He dined with the Embassy next day in the house of a third party.

<sup>5</sup> Despatch of July  $\frac{11}{7}$ , the only one relating to the negotiation to which, as far as appears, the signature of Halifax is appended. It is probable, however, that it was actually composed by Arlington, who does not even affect to preserve throughout the plural formula (*Longleat MSS.*, Henry Coventry's papers, bundle 56 - a copy). The original is in the Record Office, *State Papers* (Holland), 269, f. 94, written in a clerk's hand; the signatures autograph. It is endorsed 'R(eceived) July  $\frac{11}{7}$ h.'

of the cold reception which he had previously accorded 1672 to such overtures. Having handed the despatch to such of the States as were present, the Prince had remonstrated against the exorbitance of the demands—in especial of the English territorial ones.<sup>1</sup>

The Embassy at first inclined to regard the Prince's conduct as an earnest of success, and even contemplated a return to the French camp.<sup>2</sup> Eventually, however, it was decided to press the Prince for a speedy ultimatum,<sup>3</sup> to urge upon Louis some modification of the joint demands,<sup>4</sup> and to await the result at Antwerp. In response<sup>5</sup> Louis announced that intention of returning to Paris which, carried into effect as it was on July  $\frac{1}{2}$ , amounted to a temporary cessation of hostilities and practically saved Holland. Meanwhile he agreed to a rectification of the articles, and on July  $\frac{1}{2}$  Arlington informed Charles 'I thinke you may be secure. 1. That a peace may be speedily made w<sup>th</sup> honour and advantage to your Ma<sup>ty</sup> 2<sup>dy</sup> That the Duc of Orange will remain Souveraine of the Dutch Low Countreys. 3<sup>dy</sup> That the maritime force of it will not be in the French hands, of w<sup>ch</sup> your Subjects have expressed so much Jealousy y<sup>t</sup> they can not take pleasure in your successe.'<sup>6</sup>

His expectations, we find, were frustrated; a week later the Plenipotentiaries kissed hands at Whitehall; and eventually the States, with the Stadtholder's full approbation, returned a contemptuous refusal to the propositions of the two kings.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sluce, Cadzant, and the Brill, he thought, might pass; but not Flushing. The Stadtholder himself, we observe, was Lord of Flushing (Temple, ii. 141).

<sup>2</sup> Letter to the Prince of Orange (Record Office copy, *St. Pap.* (Holl.) 269, f. 97, dated 'Anvers ce 1<sup>re</sup> Juillet 1672'; the signatures of Buckingham and Arlington are indicated), presumably never sent.

<sup>3</sup> Copy despatch in the Record Office, *ibid.* f. 88, 'à Anvers  $\frac{11}{1}$  Juillet 1672'; this indicates the signatures of Buckingham and Arlington.

<sup>4</sup> Letter to Louvois (copy in the Record Office, 'Anvers,  $\frac{11}{1}$  Juillet,' signature of Halifax not indicated); letter to Godolphin (*ibid.* 268, Entry Book).

<sup>5</sup> Arlington to Godolphin, Antwerp, July  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; to Charles, July  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; (Record Office copies), *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> It is possible that this letter accounts for the determination of Charles to be content with 300,000*l.* or 400,000*l.* indemnity, 500,000*l.* for the fishing, and the Brill and Flushing as cautionary towns. Mentioned on the authority of Ashley (*Lauderdale Correspondence*, Cam. Soc., new series 36, p. 227, July 18).

<sup>7</sup> July 21. 'Having,' adds the *Gazette*, 'expected Fourteen days in his most Christian Majesties Camp the return of the Dutch Deputies, and some time after an answer to their Propositions. A little time will tell from whence this great silence proceeds, it is commonly guessed, That the promise, the States have of Succors from the Empire, gives them hopes of more ease that way, then they think to have by a Treaty' (*Gazette*, No. 696).

<sup>8</sup> William attempted, however, to prevent the ratification of the



1672 Brief and abortive, however, as the episode had proved, its influence on the after-career of Lord Halifax can hardly be over-estimated. We have seen reason to believe that it had culminated in a rupture more or less pronounced between Halifax and his colleagues, and that the contrast between his views and their policy had been brought to a decisive issue. It had enabled him, moreover, to study the Continental situation at first hand and at the moment of supreme crisis. Into the four weeks which it had occupied had been concentrated the decisive moments of half a century, the initial stages of the great political duel between Louis XIV. and the young Stadtholder which was only to end thirty years later with the death of William, and of which in the eyes of the principals the English Revolution was but an episode.

The remainder of the political year proved uneventful. As the autumn wore on, a belief arose that the Ministers—including, we presume, Lord Ashley, whose complaisance had been rewarded by the Great Seal and the earldom of Shaftesbury—regarded with unfeigned alarm the rising virulence of popular discontent. Financial extremity rendered a session of Parliament inevitable in the near future: it was whispered that the great men desired to deprecate public resentment by timely resignation, and the name of Lord Halifax was mentioned as that of a possible successor.

Such at least is the interpretation we place upon the following passage, which occurs in a letter from Sir William Coventry to Thomas Thynne: 'A day before y<sup>r</sup> letter came,' says the Knight, 'I heard the news of ye great remove intended, and that L<sup>d</sup> Hal: should gett a share in the pillage, though he hath not said a sillable of it to mee, whether there bee noething of it, or that hee bee enjoyned secrecy I know not.' The report, however, appears to have been unfounded, and the triumph of the disappointed diplomatist, which took a different form, was delayed until the ensuing year.

The following letters addressed during the interval to his friend the Earl of Essex, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, are not without interest. The Earl, says Burnet, had appeared early in the ranks of the Opposition; the King, imputing his action to disappointed ambition, had despatched him on an Embassy to Denmark, where he had

Promissory Act by offering Charles his own terms (the territorial ones alone excepted, for he would only promise to pledge Sluys) on condition of a breach with France (Mignet, iv. 52; Groen, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. lxxxviii)

<sup>1</sup> November 27, 1672 (*Longleat MSS.*).

gained some reputation with a strengthened bias against 1672  
despotic government. His appointment to the Vice-royalty, a few months before this date, had been no doubt intended as a concession to popular feeling; and Richard Talbot, afterwards Duke of Tyrconnel, once told Lord Halifax, as the latter records, that Halifax himself might have been selected for the post, had he not been 'so stiff ag<sup>t</sup> Popery.'<sup>1</sup> The subsequent insinuation of Halifax, however, that Essex showed an undue preference to Papists, is by no means fair. Essex, a man rather solid than brilliant, both in abilities and acquirements, was at heart, on philosophic grounds, a 'violent enemy to Popery;' but he displayed throughout his Irish administration a conspicuous moderation, a conscientious and statesmanlike energy, which have evoked the highest encomiums.<sup>2</sup>

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Essex.*<sup>3</sup>

London. Sep: 10 72.

My L<sup>d</sup>, -- It is impossible for mee not to repine at the losse of what I value so much as the honour of waiting on you; in this case, the good of Ireland, the K<sup>s</sup> service, nay, even the advantage of my L<sup>d</sup> of Essex, are no arguments to mee when [they] are against my interest, this is a cleer confession to your L<sup>th</sup>, and yet I must at the same time tell you, I am not so wholly tyed up to the consideration of what is best for myselfe, but that I have my howres of being extreemly pleased that your L<sup>th</sup>, is set in a good light, that the world may see what you are, and from thence know how to value you; I am not without my contemplations that your L<sup>th</sup> by saving Ireland, may learne to do as much for other kingdomes; I am sure you are set a part to do great (and what is more) good things towards which no bodyes wishes shall go more warmly along with you, than mine being so fully convinced of all the good that you would have beleaved of you, that I dare without an Almost ingage to resigne my opinion to your L<sup>th</sup> in all things that concern the publick being encouraged to it by the good fortune I have had, so seldome to differ with you. Without a complement my L<sup>d</sup> if you let your thoughts ever stray so farre from your businesse as to think of your humble Servants here, I beg you will preserve one, in your memory that is extreemly ambitious of it, and if your L<sup>th</sup> will oblige yet more, give me some little commission to serve you, that I may have the vanity to think myselfe of some use to one for whom I have so perfect an esteem; I came so lately out of the country. that I know nothing new worth your

<sup>1</sup> 'The Halifax note book,' Devonshire House.

<sup>2</sup> From Burnet, ii. 99-101; the Duke of Ormonde, his predecessor, who disliked him personally; Carte (Ormonde's biographer), iv. 492, 520, 538, &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Stowe MSS.*, Brit. Museum, 200, f. 224.

1672 Knowledge, and if I did, I should be unwilling to mix anything with this solemne profession I make of my being  
my L<sup>d</sup>

your L<sup>ps</sup> most faithful and most humble servant

HALIFAX.

My L<sup>d</sup>, I beg your L<sup>p</sup>, will say something very humble to my Lady and something very passionate to my Lady Betty.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

London, Dec: 12. 72.

My L<sup>d</sup>,—Whilst wee were alarum'd here with your L<sup>ps</sup> sicknesse, I did not think it good manners to trouble you with a useless letter, that could have nothing to iustify it, more than the returning my thanks for that which I receaved from you; but now that your L<sup>dp</sup> is freed from your danger, and your friends from their fears for you, I beg leave to tell you, no man could bee more concerned at the melancholy newes wee had of you, nor more pleased to hear you are restored to the health I wish you. If it should fayle, it would incline the world to beleeve the prayers of all good men are of no use, for I am sure your L<sup>dp</sup> hath that preservative in as great a measure as ever any one had, and I am as sure you will ever deserve them; the worst to mee is, every body wisheth your L<sup>dp</sup> so much good, that it is hard for mee to wish you more, and yet I would fayne distinguish myself from all the rest of the world in my respects to you, which are grounded upon so much esteem, and upon so perfect a knowledge of what is due to you, that nothing is more unalterable, than my being,

my L<sup>d</sup>

Your L<sup>ps</sup> most faithfull humble servant,

HALIFAX.<sup>2</sup>

*The same to the same.*<sup>3</sup>

Dec: 21. 72.

My L<sup>d</sup>,—I give your L<sup>dp</sup> this trouble at the instance of Maior Beversham, who being apprehensive hee may fall under your displeasure for staying so long from his command, desireth mee to intercede for him with this excuse, that hee hath been extreemly ill, and since his recovery hath been hindred from going over by reasons hee could not dispense with; but that hee will in a very short time wait upon your L<sup>dp</sup> to make that excuse for himselfe which is now made in his behalfe by

My L<sup>d</sup>,

Your L<sup>ps</sup> most faithfull and most obedient servant,

HALIFAX.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Stowe MSS.*, Brit. Museum, 200, f. 433.

<sup>2</sup> Addressed 'For his Excellency the Earle of Essex Lt<sup>e</sup> Lieutenant of Ireland.' Endorsed 'Lord Halifax Rec. Jan 14.'

<sup>3</sup> *Stowe MSS.*, Brit. Museum, 200, f. 453.

<sup>4</sup> Address and endorsement identical with the preceding letter.

Projects other than political appear to have occupied Lord Halifax during the autumn, for in November 1670<sup>1</sup> he contracted a (second) matrimonial alliance with Gertrude, youngest daughter of his neighbour<sup>2</sup> and fellow Commissioner of Accounts, Mr. William Pierrepont, of Thoresby, Notts, the distinguished Parliamentary leader. Of her sisters one had married his friend Lord Ogle; another was the wife of Lord Clare, a political associate. The second Lady Halifax cannot have been very young<sup>3</sup> at the time of her marriage, nor does she appear to have been well dowered.<sup>4</sup> She had, however, the reputation of unusual beauty<sup>5</sup>—a reputation which, to judge by the exquisite engraving extant<sup>6</sup> was entirely deserved. A curious story preserved by Reresby<sup>7</sup> bears witness to her personal charm, and reveals the fact that a treaty of marriage had been contemplated between her and William, afterwards the famous Lord Russell. Dr. Maty, in his biography of her grandson, the fourth Earl of Chesterfield (who was brought up under her care), writes of her, no doubt upon the best authority, with great enthusiasm. 'Her mind,' he says,<sup>8</sup> 'seems to have been congenial with that of her . . . lord, and her understanding and wit were still exceeded by the goodness of her heart.' Her house in the days of her widowhood seems, according to the same authority,<sup>9</sup> to have been the meeting-place of the best political society. He lays special

<sup>1</sup> *Hutton Correspondence*, i. 102-3; *Pierrepont* by G. E. C. ix. 131.

<sup>2</sup> There was also, through the Talbots, a connection between the families. Mr. Pierrepont was younger son of the Earl of Kingston. His wisdom, prudence, and constitutional knowledge are highly eulogised by Burnet (*MS. History*, in British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,581, f. 37b). He was usually known as 'wise Pierrepont,' and died in 1679, aged seventy-one (*Pepys*, i. 67).

<sup>3</sup> See anecdote given below, ascribed by Reresby to the year 1661.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> 'Lady Halifax has lost no beauty in the country,' writes Rachel Lady Russell to her husband (*Letters* (1819), p. 229, Sept. 17, 1680).

<sup>6</sup> By Bartolozzi, after Lely; given opposite page 15 of the memoir prefixed by Dr. Maty to the *Miscellaneous Works* of the fourth Earl of Chesterfield (1777). Her portrait (query, the original by Lely) is enumerated among the treasures of Welbeck. Another, together with that of her predecessor, Lady Dorothy, is mentioned in an account of the Rufford pictures (*Beauties of England and Wales*, 1813, Nottinghamshire, p. 388).

<sup>7</sup> Anno 1664, eight years previously, Sir Henry Bellasys, eldest son of Lord Bellasys, remarried, at his father's desire, with a rich heiress (for her subsequent history, see Burnet, ii. 16). He had, however, previously fixed his affections on Mistress Gertrude Pierrepont, and 'though the young lady all this time gave him no encouragement in the least, but was exactly virtuous,' he publicly asserted that she should never marry any other man. Hearing of the treaty with Russell, Sir Henry, on a flimsy pretext, challenged him; but as the treaty fell through, Reresby prevailed on Sir Henry to withdraw his defiance (Reresby, *Memoirs*, p. 61). He fell in a duel, 1667 (*Pepys*).

<sup>8</sup> Page 24.

<sup>9</sup> Pages 25, 67.

- 1672 stress upon the refinement of her taste, and describes her influence as the best to which the youth of her grandson was susceptible. Mutual esteem and affection are suggested by the few references to Lady Halifax which occur in her husband's letters, and it is as his 'deare wife' that she appears in his will. A daughter, born in 1675, was the only surviving issue of this marriage, and the children of the first wife seem to have found in the second Lady Halifax a kindly stepmother.

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV

### *The Paper drawn up by the Citizens of Middleburgh.<sup>1</sup>*

Wee y<sup>r</sup> underwritten Burgers & Inhabitants of the City of Middleburgh having heard the report of some of Our Deputyes & the Relation of the Burgomester Vanderhogen (?) declare Our thoughts & Intentions as followeth : (viz :)

1. That Wee will maintaine with Our <sup>Lives</sup> blood & <sup>Fortunes</sup> Estates the Wellfare of Our Country together with our liberty, which our Ancestors have purchased so dear.
2. That having seen the proposition that some of the Provinces are inclined to make an agreement with the King of France, Wee do not consent thereto.
3. That with all speed some bee deputed to his High<sup>n</sup> the Prince of Orange to desire him to come to us with all his friends & Allyes that by his assistance & the blessing of God Wee may keep the Enemy from the Province & City.
4. And if it should please God not to give a blessing to Our armes, so that there should not be a probability of withstanding the force of Our Enemy Wee will then choose rather to joine with England & to putt Ourselves under their protection upon the best conditions Wee can procure for the conservation of Our religion & government.

Made at Middleburgh the 19th day of June 1672.

<sup>1</sup> *St. Pap.* (foreign : Flanders) June-July 1672 (copy). (See p. 82, note 6.)

## CHAPTER V

IN OPPOSITION 1673-79: RELATIONS WITH LORD  
SHAFTESBURY AND SIR WILLIAM COVENTRY.

WE must now return again to the general concerns of the nation, for when, on February 6th, Parliament reassembled the Administration found itself exposed to a burst of national resentment, far more violent and far more justly directed than the torrent before which, five years previously, Lord Clarendon had succumbed. The real motives of the war and of the Indulgence were gauged with extraordinary accuracy,<sup>1</sup> and among those members—an overwhelming majority—who had resolved that the general indignation should find adequate expression in Parliament Lord Halifax and William Coventry stood conspicuous. The Government, however, though credited with the gloomiest anticipations, did not flinch. Its representative in the Lower House, indeed—the new Secretary, Henry Coventry—seemed disposed to content himself with the execution of his official duties. But the King's Speech was blunt and resolute; the Chancellor, Lord Shaftesbury, endorsed to the full the disastrous policy of the three preceding years.<sup>2</sup> The Lower House meanwhile, under the statesmanlike guidance of Sir William,<sup>3</sup> displayed both firmness and moderation.

The Romanist tendencies of the Government were the first and most obvious point of attack. The irregular 'Indulgence' of 1672 (whereof the real object was

<sup>1</sup> See *Hutton Correspondence*, i. 118, and a despatch of the French Ambassador, June 7, 1672 (Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. app. ii.): 'One sees nothing but libels and seditious writings. My Lord Arlington has shown me one which gives a perfectly true account of the designs of the King of England.' The diplomatist foretold with curious exactness the course which the Houses would pursue.

<sup>2</sup> Even the act of National Bankruptcy, against which he had in private protested.

<sup>3</sup> Who criticised the 'form' while approving the 'matter' of the Declaration, and maintained that the dispensing power of the Crown, by common consent, could only become valid during the *intervals* of Parliament. He discreetly waived any intention of defining prerogative and liberty (Grey's *Debates*).

1678 vehemently suspected) came in for special reprobation; but the Commons freely offered to secure *by Bill* that relief to *Protestant Dissenters* which had been its ostensible motive. In vain did Shaftesbury urge upon his Sovereign the rejection of this compromise and the reassertion of *Prerogative*. Alarmed for the prospects of Supply, Charles on the advice of the terrified Arlington referred the legality of his Declaration to the Lords.

During the discussion that ensued Lord Halifax seems to have assumed a leading- we surmise, the leading—part among the champions of the ‘Country’ interest. Of his speeches on the occasion, however, but one fragment survives, in the form of an utterance at once significant and characteristic, which affected to an incalculable extent his subsequent relations with the *Heir-Presumptive*. ‘He said, if we could make good the eastern compliment *O king, live for ever!* he could trust the King with everything; but since that was so much a compliment, that it could never become real, he could not be implicit in his confidence.’<sup>1</sup> The allusion to the Duke of York is transparent, and Burnet, who tells the story, declares that James from that moment conceived a hatred against Halifax such as even Shaftesbury in his most violent moments never subsequently inspired.

The Lords in effect supported the Commons,<sup>2</sup> and upon the evening of March 7 Charles prudently surrendered the point<sup>3</sup> and cancelled his Declaration. The mortification of the Chancellor was extreme; disgusted at the weakness of his master, alarmed for his own safety, and influenced, it is possible, by more honourable motives,<sup>4</sup> he instantly fraternised with the Opposition, in which his brother-in-law (William Coventry) and his nephew (Lord Halifax) were already so conspicuous.

Nor were the just apprehensions of the Opposition on the religious count by any means dispelled. The celebrated ‘Test Act,’<sup>5</sup> framed for the effective exclusion of Papists from all offices civil or military, appears to have

<sup>1</sup> Burnet, ii. 103 (edit. 1833).

<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax sat upon the large Committee appointed to draw up the ‘Bill of Advice.’

<sup>3</sup> France, alarmed for the supplies, on which the future of the Dutch war depended, strongly urged the concession.

<sup>4</sup> It is believed that the panic-stricken Arlington betrayed to him at this conjuncture the real tenor of the ‘Dover Treaty’ (Christie’s *Shaftesbury*, ii. 140).

<sup>5</sup> ‘An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants,’ &c.

received in a very special manner the sanction of Halifax and Sir William Coventry.<sup>1</sup> Concerning the action of the younger man, we possess indeed, unfortunately, no particulars,<sup>2</sup> but we learn that his prominence in the matter won for him a peculiar place in the admiration of foreign Protestants.<sup>3</sup> During the debates, again, on the promised 'Bill of Ease' for Protestant Dissenters the energy of both<sup>4</sup> seems to have been remarkable; but ere this could become law an interruption occurred. So far—in consequence, we suspect, of William Coventry's efforts—the relations between the Government and the Opposition had never overpassed the limits of strained and guarded civility. The hotter spirits, however, in the ranks of the 'Country' party were desirous of proceedings more extreme, and certain ominous references to 'Evil Counsellors' had been heard within the walls of the Lower House. The consequence was immediate; by Court influence an 'Act of Grace,' pleadable in bar of an impeachment, was hurriedly rushed through both Houses, and the Session terminated with a sudden prorogation (March 28, 29).

From the tactics which had induced this step William Coventry, as we have already hinted, had withheld his sanction.<sup>5</sup> Anxious though he subsequently showed himself for the political annihilation of the 'Cabal,' he shrank with a very modern sagacity from intensifying political animosities by the terrible solvent of blood. His moderation was highly distasteful to his more violent followers,<sup>6</sup> and we fancy that his continued intimacy with his brother Henry aroused among the same section considerable suspicion.

Nor can we avoid comparing this contempt for party

<sup>1</sup> Grey's *Debates*.

<sup>2</sup> His name occurs as one of eleven managers who, in a conference between the Houses concerning details, March 24, represented the Upper House. The differences were compromised.

<sup>3</sup> Henry Sayle to his brother, 1680 (*Sayle Correspondence*, p. 136).

<sup>4</sup> For Halifax, see *Lords' Journal*, March 19-29, xii. 560-585; this gives no clue to his sympathies in the matter, but that he approved the Bill may be presumed. For Coventry, see Grey's *Debates*.

<sup>5</sup> He had left town as soon as direct attacks upon the Ministers seemed imminent (Grey's *Debates*, March 15, ii. 107-116, *Longleat MSS.*, Sir William Coventry to Thomas Thynne, March 22).

<sup>6</sup> Letter to Thomas Thynne, March 31: 'I foresaw somewhat like this w<sup>ch</sup> hath fall'n out (1) that the country Gent. had a good mind to fall on somebody & that the Grandees either had noe mind to it, or durst not trust their followers, I am glad I was at Minster' (a country place he had taken), 'or else I am sure I should have bin blamed on both sides, one side would have blamed mee for not assisting (it being w<sup>ch</sup> I love not), and the other would have suspected mee for putting it on underhand.'



1673 tyrannies, this abhorrence of extremes, with the so-called 'Trimming policy' which Lord Halifax in later years so openly professed; or fail to remember that the obloquy which is the almost invariable penalty of intellectual independence became the portion of the nephew, no less than of the uncle. How far at this earlier crisis Lord Halifax may have shared the views of Sir William and the odium which they incurred we cannot tell; it is clear, however, that Coventry shrank from involving the younger man in his own momentary unpopularity.<sup>1</sup> 'I should be glad,' he writes to Thomas Thynne, 'to heare from you (for I must not expect it from him) how L<sup>d</sup> Hal. hath made up his matters, I hope hee is not like myselfe out w<sup>th</sup> all sides. though I doe not regrette it for myselfe . . . yett I doe not thinke it is a good posture for a man whoe desires to bee in the world & in businesse.'<sup>2</sup>

The following letters belong to this recess:—

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Esser.*<sup>3</sup>

April 25. 73.

My L<sup>d</sup>.—I had rather take the opportunities of paying my service to you than (?) of presenting it, but that being out of my choice your L<sup>th</sup> will I hope allow mee this way of recommending myselfe to your memory till I may bee so happy as to give better evidence of the perfect value and esteem I have for you, which maketh it a pleasant sound to mee, to hear that My L<sup>d</sup> of Essex is the first man that could ever at the same time governe and please such an unruly province, that all sorts of people are satisfyed that are fit to bee so and for the rest, who would be angry, your L<sup>th</sup> is so spitefull as to furnish them with no objections to you, to iustify them; and this, I confesse, is a piece of rigour, beyond what any of your Predecessours in your place have ever practised and who knoweth but this may bee as ill taken as any thing you could do? for my part I could almost wish it was, that I might hope to see your L<sup>th</sup> recalled for acting without precedent, but upon second thoughts, I must bee content, for a publick good, to supresse my own desires of waiting on you here, but it ought to bee a warning never to give our

<sup>1</sup> So conscious of this obloquy was Sir William that he had newly resolved at one moment to take advantage of the loop-hole for retirement which, as he fancied, the 'Test Act' afforded. The House of Commons had left it undecided whether the Act extended to its own members as such (Grey's *Debates*, March 29). The Judges decided that it did so apply. Sir William had thought of vacating his seat by a neglect to comply with this ruling, since, as he submitted, his aversion to Popery could not be questioned. He finally, however, abandoned this scheme, in consequence, as he explains, of his 'perpetuall unwillingnesse to doe things w<sup>ch</sup> I cannot undoe' (letter to Thomas Thynne, May 10).

<sup>2</sup> March 31 (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>3</sup> *Stowe MSS.*, British Museum, 201, f. 381.

selves up to one,<sup>1</sup> that is so necessary to Mankind; A Mean 1673  
would do (?) well between your L<sup>dy</sup> that is good for every thing,  
and mee that am good for nothing; yet in spite of this in-  
equality, I will bee answerable that my devotion to your service  
is too well grounded ever to bee altered. I do not pretend to  
write any newes, knowing you will hear it better from others  
therefore I will onely beg your L<sup>dy</sup> will make my complements  
to my Lady, and belevee mee

My L<sup>d</sup>

Your most obedient and humblest servant

HALIFAX.<sup>1</sup>

*The same to the same.*<sup>2</sup>

July 31. 73.

My L<sup>d</sup>,—I wish for better occasions of paying my respect  
to you, than the telling you how sorry I am to hear of any  
mourning in your L<sup>dy</sup>s family, for which those that are of it  
can hardly bee more concerned by their relation than I am by  
the esteem I have for your L<sup>dy</sup> who is the head of it. If my  
wishes had any power in them, you should never have occasion  
to receive any compliments of this kind, and your friends should  
be put to it, to vary their expressions, in rejoyning (?) every post  
for some new accession of greatnesse and prosperity that should  
happen to you.

I cannot in one particular conceal the satisfaction I had to  
see your L<sup>dy</sup> so fully iustified lately upon a debate, that the  
rules you had made, and against which such a storme hath  
been raised, are allowed with all the respect that could bee to  
your L<sup>dy</sup> who will alwayes bee a gainer, by having whatever you  
do strictly examined. I do not think it possible my good for-  
tune should ever preferre mee so as to put mee in a capacity of  
serving you, though I should bee sorry that were as desperate  
as any publique preferment to which I lay so little clayme,  
knowing my selfe unfit for it, That it is in your L<sup>dy</sup>s power to  
satisfy my whole ambition, by owning mee,

My L<sup>d</sup>

Your most faithfull, and  
humblest servant

HALIFAX.

I beg my most humble service  
may bee presented to my Lady.<sup>3</sup>

*The same to the same.*<sup>4</sup>

Aug. 28. 73.

My L<sup>d</sup>,— The obliging notice you are pleased to take of my  
Zeale to serve you, raiseth my ambition still more to do it more

<sup>1</sup> Endorsed 'Lord Halifax rec May 8.'

<sup>2</sup> *Stowe MSS.* 202, f. 251. Apparently partly in answer to a letter of  
June 21, of which a copy exists in the Essex letter book (*Bodleyan MSS.*),  
quoted in note 5 of the next page.

<sup>3</sup> Endorsed 'Lord Halifax rec. Aug. 14.'

<sup>4</sup> *Stowe. MSS.* 202, f. 332. In answer to a letter of August 5 (Essex

1673 effectually, for which if I had the opportunities as frequent as I have the desires, I would give full evidence of my being as much your L<sup>ds</sup> as any man in the world, and that from a principle of esteem to which you have so much right, that it is as impossible for mee not to have it, as for your L<sup>dp</sup> not to deserve it, but you have imposed a task upon mee, which you will never give me the opportunity to obey you in, which is to acquaint you with your faylings,<sup>1</sup> to which I can say nothing till I see them, and when I do, it will be as unexpected a thing to mee, as it would bee to see some other men in the right; but in all cases what ever your L<sup>dp</sup> can think a part of friendship, you may safely expect from mee, and if my understanding misleads mee in the manner of it, let that alone bear the blame, without lessening your kindnesse to,

My L<sup>d</sup>

your L<sup>ds</sup>

most full humble

and obedient servant

HALIFAX.

I beseech your L<sup>dp</sup> to make my most humble service acceptable to my Lady.<sup>2</sup>

The premature termination of the session had brought, of course, into particular prominence the next burning question: What result would the 'Test Act' produce upon the constitution of the Ministry? The answer was startling. Ten weeks later Clifford<sup>3</sup> and the Duke of York by the resignation of all their offices declared themselves, to the general consternation, members of the Roman Church.<sup>4</sup>

Through these secessions the great 'Cabal' received its death-blow. Shaftesbury and Buckingham had already grasped the necessity of courting popular favour, and their Ministerial days were numbered. Arlington, demoralised by terror, fully contemplated a voluntary retirement.<sup>5</sup> The friends of Lord Halifax seem to have hoped that the King might attempt to conciliate public opinion by his promotion;<sup>6</sup> but the influence of Clifford

letter book, *Bodleian MSS.*, Add. C. 33, f. 177b) thanking Lord Halifax for his 'obliging' championship of his friend in the Privy Council; 'tho I am confident what you tryed was for his Ma<sup>ties</sup> service yet I cannot but Clayme a pticular share to myself in ye Oblig<sup>n</sup>.'

<sup>1</sup> 'I desire . . . in case you should hear of any miscarriage . . . you will Please Frankly to acquaint me w<sup>th</sup> it . . .' (*ibid.*).

<sup>2</sup> Endorsed 'Lord Halifax rec<sup>d</sup> Sept. 22.'

<sup>3</sup> Much to the surprise of William Coventry (letter to Thomas Thynne, *Longleat MSS.*, May 31).

<sup>4</sup> Vide the Devonshire House 'note book'.

<sup>5</sup> During the summer of 1674 he retired into the secure impotence of the Lord Chamberlainship. Lauderdale, Secretary for Scotland, exercised little influence over English affairs.

<sup>6</sup> 'We are told,' writes Lord Essex from Dublin Castle, June 21, 1673,

and of the Duke of York, despite their retirement, availed 1673 to secure a less popular choice.

The 'White Staff' of the Treasury was conferred on Sir Thomas Osborne,<sup>1</sup> Savile's former associate, who had become known as a fluent speaker, an active man of business, and a somewhat unscrupulous courtier; nor had the rumour<sup>2</sup> which suggested his almost immediate supersession by Sir William Coventry<sup>3</sup> any justification.

Much, however, had been effected. Upon Charles II. himself the events of the spring had made an impression which was never effaced. He perceived for the first time the intensity of the dread with which the nation regarded Popery; he realised with equal force that the Act by which the employment of Roman Catholic officials became an impossibility had deprived him in this connection of all power to contravene the national will. From this moment Charles, as distinguished from his brother, deliberately abandoned the 'grande affaire.'

Nor did the nation at large and Lord Halifax in particular fail to grasp the significance of these remarkable transactions. That the Heir-Presumptive was a member of the Roman Catholic communion, that a scheme for the re-establishment by force and fraud of the alien faith had been framed and initiated with his express concurrence, and that the design had been entirely checkmated by the passing of the 'Test Act,' are facts which a candid Roman Catholic is the last to deny, and which the 'Country' party of 1673 had thoroughly mastered. These data once admitted, the inference is inevitable; in regarding thence-

'of several alterations & changes att Court, methinks if any such thing arrives, y<sup>e</sup> L<sup>d</sup> should in y<sup>e</sup> first Place be remembred. . . . I am sure I wish it both in regard I know you a Person most proper to do his Ma<sup>ty</sup> Service in some eminent Station, & also (If it be allowable to confess so much self-love) out of y<sup>e</sup> particular kindness & friendship I have for you' (*Bodleian MSS. Add. C. 33* [Essex letter book], f. 154).

<sup>1</sup> He owed his appointment to the Duke of York, who had known him as Treasurer of the Navy; and to Clifford, who had been with him in the Treasury.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 491.

<sup>3</sup> Or the Duke of Ormond. The Knight himself treated the report with indifference. 'I believe,' he wrote on July 13 to Thomas Thynne, 'the rumour concerning my restoration can have proceeded from nothing so probably as from L<sup>d</sup> Halifax's journey hither, w<sup>ch</sup> the politicians of the Coffee houses will have to have some deepe signification. whereas God knowes it was not in either of our thoughts to give ground to such constructions.' 'Since such stirres,' he adds, August 11, 'have bin raised from L<sup>d</sup> Hal: visitt hither I exspect new ones & such as I canAot forsece may arise from mine to a secretary of State' (his brother, then at 'The Bath'). - *Longleat MSS.*

1673-74 forward the 'Test Act' as an indispensable condition of our religious independence, the circumstances of the time considered, Lord Halifax argued correctly. We may deplore indeed, with as much heartiness as any 'bigot for toleration' by whom the Act has been denounced, the hardship which was thus inflicted upon a deserving minority; yet we must admit that the Papists did but expiate vicariously, as is so often the case, the follies and the duplicity of those by whom they had been employed as a pawn in the political game.

The pecuniary straits of the Administration necessitated an autumn session. The Houses, alarmed by the continued maintenance of a considerable force (originally raised for a descent on Zealand, which had been frustrated by the perfidy of the French), followed up their previous success by a vigorous onslaught upon the foreign policy of the Government. Sir William Coventry denounced<sup>1</sup> the French alliance in language of unusual warmth; <sup>2</sup> Supply was practically refused; while the standing army was stigmatised as a grievance. After an eight days' session<sup>3</sup> Charles suddenly prorogued, and less than a week later<sup>4</sup> Lord Shaftesbury, who by this time had completely identified himself with the national interest,<sup>5</sup> was deprived of the Great Seal.<sup>6</sup> In his own felicitous phrase he only laid down the gown to take up the sword. With consummate dexterity he metamorphosed himself into a popular politician; and his daring, his eloquence, his fertility of resource soon practically obliterated, as he intended they should obliterate, the events of 1672.

He naturally assumed the position of leader among the politicians whose ranks he had joined, and under his energetic generalship the tactics of the Opposition gained in vigour and its organisation in precision. During the

<sup>1</sup> See for his feeling on this topic his letters of this summer (*Longleat MSS.*); also (if it be his indeed) the 'Appeal' already quoted, which appeared during the recess.

<sup>2</sup> *Grey's Debates*, ii. 203, 212; and *Von Ranke*, iv. 463.

<sup>3</sup> The Lords had sat four days, Halifax attending on each occasion.

<sup>4</sup> November 9.

<sup>5</sup> See Christie. Some of the projects which he submitted to Charles in this connection are somewhat unscrupulous. He proposed, as Buckingham had once proposed, to supersede the Duke of York by divorcing the childless queen, or declaring Monmouth legitimate. The young duke was ignorant of this proposal (Christie, ii. 118; Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 70; *State Papers*, iii. 80, edition 1704).

<sup>6</sup> His brother-in-law, Henry Coventry, was compelled to announce his dismissal. The French saw more clearly than Charles the danger of providing the Opposition with such a leader. Louis offered Shaftesbury 10,000*l.* to seek a reconciliation and resume office (Christie, ii. 155, 180-3).

session which ensued two months later Lords Shaftesbury, 1673  
Halifax, Holles, Carlisle, Salisbury, &c., met regularly at  
Lord Holles' house.<sup>1</sup> We suspect, however, that despite  
the exigencies of the existing political situation, and the  
extenuating circumstances which might be argued on their  
brilliant kinsman's behalf, neither Halifax nor Sir William  
Coventry ever entirely condoned his share in the counsels  
of 1670-73.

During the spring session of 1671<sup>2</sup> the foreign re-  
lations of the Government were again subjected to a  
scathing criticism. The determination of the Houses  
compelled a peace with Holland<sup>2</sup> on much the same lines  
as those advocated by Lord Halifax at the French camp  
in 1672. The action of the two senior Plenipotentiaries  
during that episode was much questioned, and both  
Buckingham and Arlington appeared before the Lower  
House in their own vindication. An address for the dis-  
grace of Buckingham, his attendance at the Opposition  
meetings notwithstanding,<sup>3</sup> was duly carried; and the  
tacit acquittal of Arlington, due to reasons unconnected  
with politics,<sup>4</sup> is said to have occasioned much disgust in  
the breasts of Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Sir William  
Coventry.<sup>5</sup>

Nor was the mind of the country, after all, by any  
means satisfied on the religious question. The perva-  
sion of the Duke of York, now so openly avowed, created  
a general sense of insecurity; and Shaftesbury, in some-  
what inflammatory fashion, forced the danger of the crisis  
upon the notice of the House of Lords. A debate as to  
the best means of securing the Protestant religion took  
place January 24; <sup>6</sup> various expedients were suggested, and  
the more detailed examination of these, with the drafting  
of appropriate Bills, was referred to a Committee of  
the whole House. Of these projects, two demand our  
special attention.<sup>7</sup> Lord Halifax moved that all Popish

<sup>1</sup> *Diet. Nat. Biog.*, art. 'Cooper' (Anthony Ashley), from *Esser Papers*,  
British Museum.

<sup>2</sup> February 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Esser Papers*, as above.

<sup>4</sup> In especial to the good offices of his brother-in-law, the popular Lord  
Osborn.

<sup>5</sup> Courtenay's *Life of Temple*, ii. 93.

<sup>6</sup> See *Lords' Journal*, February 3, 10, 14, 20, 21; Macpherson, *Original  
Papers*, i. 71 (from the *Memoirs* of James, who was present); *Hist. MSS.  
Com. Rep.* ix., part 2, p. 42.

<sup>7</sup> In addition Lord Salisbury advocated the education of the children of  
the Royal Family in the Protestant religion. Lord Mordaunt moved the  
regulation of the Queen Consort's household. The suppression of atheism and  
profaneness was another head. Suggestions for ensuring the education in

1677<sup>77</sup> recusants, or persons reputed to be such, be disarmed. Lord Carlisle proposed arrangements for restricting the future intermarriages of the Royal Line to the scions of Protestant houses—a motion the more pointed since both the Queen and the Duchess of York were professed Papists. During the debate upon this point in Committee a very remarkable discussion took place.<sup>1</sup> ‘Carlisle and Halifax proposed, that the penalty should be the declaring them<sup>2</sup> incapable of succession.’<sup>3</sup> A retort of Lord Peterborough to the effect that the notion was ‘horrid’ evoked from Shaftesbury the counter-assertion that ‘unless retrospective,’ the proposal was neither ‘horrid’ nor unprecedented. Others, however, criticised the motion as illegal,<sup>4</sup> as contrary to the rules of Christianity in general—to the principles of the Church of England in particular;<sup>5</sup> and although the Houses resolved that none of the Blood Royal within certain degrees should marry a Papist without consent of Parliament, the proposed penalty was rejected ‘with scorn.’

In view of subsequent developments this episode is extremely curious. But we must remark that the suggestion of Lord Halifax appears to have been merely prospective, and offers therefore no real analogy to the ‘Exclusion’ projects (1679–81) which he so strenuously opposed. The Committee eventually reported<sup>6</sup> eight resolutions. The first of these<sup>7</sup> was entrusted<sup>8</sup> to Lords Shaftesbury and Salisbury, with directions to prepare a Bill; the remaining seven<sup>9</sup> were placed under the charge of Lord Halifax for a like purpose. By this time, however, the daring tactics and violent language of Shaftesbury had given the Government serious cause for anxiety. Charles suddenly prorogued, and three months later the ex-Chancellor was dismissed the Council. Lord Halifax remained therefore the only one of the leading Opposition statesmen entitled to a seat on the board.

We have already insinuated our belief that, despite the Protestant religion of heirs-apparent to peerages and of Popish orphans, with the whole question of perversions, and of education in foreign seminaries, were subsequently referred to the same Committee.

<sup>1</sup> Macpherson, *Original Papers*, from the *Memoirs* of James II.

<sup>2</sup> The delinquents.

<sup>3</sup> The matter is incorrectly stated in the *Lauderdale Papers*, iii. 33 (Kincaidine to Lauderdale), February 10, 1677; and in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv., part 4, p. 99, letter of February 12 (on ramour).

<sup>4</sup> So Lord Keeper Finch.

<sup>5</sup> So the Bishop of Winchester.

<sup>6</sup> Concerning the education of the Royal children.

<sup>7</sup> February 14.

<sup>8</sup> February 16.

<sup>9</sup> See *ante*. The fifth head (concerning atheism and profaneness) had been relegated to a sub-committee (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ix.; part 2, p. 43).

the political ties<sup>f</sup> which connected them, and to which each in his capacity continued loyal, the relations between Lord Shaftesbury on the one hand and Lord Halifax and Sir William Coventry on the other were never, during the whole period of their opposition to the Court, completely cordial. We fancy that both Halifax and Sir William, while severed from the ex-Chancellor by the memories of 1672, regarded with some distrust his rather unscrupulous audacity. It is certain that the importance which they attached to the progress of affairs on the Continent found but a feeble echo in Lord Shaftesbury's mind. It is even more certain that the moderation of Sir William, shared in a less degree by Lord Halifax, was little to the taste of the more impetuous convert; and that he explained it, or affected to explain it, as a sign of indifference or self-interest. During the summer of 1674 Sir William Coventry—for the first time, we gather, after his disgrace—was received at Court.<sup>1</sup> The incident, as Lord Halifax had warned him would be the case,<sup>2</sup> excited comment. 'I am sorry,' sneers Lord Shaftesbury in a party circular of six months later,<sup>3</sup> 'my Lord Halifax had no better success in his summer's negotiation; and that his uncle Sir William could make no nearer approach to the Ministers of State than the kissing the King's hand. I fear it is fatal to his Lordship's uncle to go so far, and no farther.' The sarcasm is not absolutely intelligible with our present lights, but it appears to insinuate that Halifax and Sir William were desirous of Court preferment.

Two letters to Lord Essex belong to this period:—

*Viscount Halifax to the Earl of Essex.<sup>4</sup>*

March 23. 73 ( $\frac{73}{73}$ ).

My L<sup>d</sup>.—I am easily persuaded by any pretence of presenting my humble service to you, a duty I should oftner pay were

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Thomas Thynne, August 11, 1674 (*Longleat MSS.*). His interview with the King, he says, was brief: 'A short compliment on my part & a shorter answer on his.' That w<sup>th</sup> his R. H. was more at large.

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Coventry to Thomas Thynne, November 11 (*Longleat MSS.*): 'I had an expression some what like y<sup>r</sup> post script from L<sup>d</sup> H; I am a little puzzled at the reason of it, all I can bee sure of in it, is, that it is meant very kindly, but w<sup>ho</sup>e could doe me harme in such a journey I know not, nor am I like to try.'

<sup>3</sup> The letter, which was ostensibly written to a political friend, will I found in Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 200. It seems to be mentioned by Sir William Coventry, writing to Thomas Thynne, February 20, 1673, under the description of 'L. S. circular letter.' He adds that since enemies & their criticisms may prove the truest friends, 'I shall bee glad to make that use of my old acquaintance' (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>4</sup> *Stowe MSS.* 204, f. 318.



1674 I not restrained by a greater duty, which 'Is, not, to give you unnecessary trouble, besides that I am so impudently secure of the continuance of your L<sup>dp</sup>s favour to mee, that I do not suspect you will let mee forfeit it, by any omission I can make of laying my clayme to it, whilst my resolutions to serve you are so intire, and so impossible to bee altered. The bearer my L<sup>d</sup>, is a kinsman of mine,<sup>1</sup> who doth not repine to bee sent out of England into Ireland, since it giveth him the honour of being under your L<sup>dp</sup>s command; I am so much concerned for him, as to take the liberty of recommending him to your L<sup>dp</sup> that either in the assignement of his quarters, or in any other reasonable sute hee shall make, you will vouchsafe him as much favor as is fit for him to expect, and I do not doubt but he will endeavour to deserve it as much as his small station will admitt, and I shall in his behalf own myself as much obliged, as if your kindnesse was immediately conferred upon,

My L<sup>d</sup>

Your L<sup>dp</sup>s most faithfull and humblest servant,

HALIFAX.<sup>2</sup>

*The same to the same.*<sup>3</sup>

Sep: 16. 71.

My L<sup>d</sup>, I must not lose the priviledge you have allowed mee, of sometimes presenting my service to you, which I should do much oftner, if I had any pretence to iustify mee in it. I am tempted to it at present, both by the good opportunity of sending and to hasten my excuse, that I did not wait upon my Lady when she passed by here; the truth is I could not imagine, her stay would bee so short, and intended to pay my duty to her the next day beleeving it better manners to do so, than to trouble her immediately upon her arrivall, else, I should have been as early in my respects to her, as any of those that had the good fortune to pay them, and this I beg your L<sup>dp</sup> to say in iustification of mee.

Wee are listening for great newes from abroad, expecting to hear of some great ingagement now that the Armyes are so near one another.

If wee can keep our happy neutrality, enjoy peace at home, and have all the trade of the world, whilst they are at cusses, Nothing but Christianity can make us wish the warre should cease, since wee are so much gainers by it.

It is more than I can hope for ever to have an occasion of serving your L<sup>dp</sup> here, if I had, I would give evidence of my zeale, which now I must beg you will beleeve upon the word of

My L<sup>d</sup>

your most humble and obedient servant

HALIFAX.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Presumably a Major Radcliffe (see p. 121, note 5).

<sup>2</sup> Addressed 'For his Excellency The Earle of Essex, L<sup>d</sup> Lieutenant of Ireland.'

<sup>3</sup> *Stowe MSS.* 206, f. 55.

<sup>4</sup> Addressed 'For his Excellence The L<sup>d</sup> Lieutenant of Ireland.'

The long prorogation which intervened between the session of 1673-74 and that of 1675 affords us a good opportunity for reverting to the domestic concerns of Lord Halifax. Henry, his son and heir, was at this time about thirteen. It does not appear that he had ever been at a public school, and indeed the public schools of the day answered little to his father's ideal. 'Another great cause' (says 'Saviliana') 'of the decay of vertue his Lordship attributed to the wrong education of the youth. His Lordship would have had School Masters to have been old and grave, taken out of all orders of men, Lords for young noblemen, Gentlemen for the young Gentry, and so in lower degrees. These men, if unwilling, to be forced by Law into the imployment for a time; The place to be lookt upon as one of the most honorable; without any Salary at all from Schoolboys, only with a Stipend from the Government where the men would take it; Their chief care being that the youths should be punisht for immorality more than for want of proficiency in learning; and that all should be taught to read and to write and to cast accounts, but not any brought up to languages and sciences, except such as had parts that would answer; And that Shoals of such as had not, should be released from Study, and timely sent home, to make artificers and souldiers. It being his Lordship's opinion, that nothing distresses the commonwealth so much as half learned men, and that downright quiet ignorance is much to be preferred before restless, conceited knowledge.'

If we except the curiously unpractical suggestion that schoolmasters should be recruited by an intellectual conscription, one is struck by the unexpectedly modern flavour of these propositions. The training of gentlemen by gentlemen is the boasted distinction of our great public schools;<sup>1</sup> with free education, State control, and the three R's have long been classic formulas. Some of us are even bold enough to endorse the opinions of Lord Halifax in a more heterodox particular, and to maintain that higher education, if pressed upon minds which are not specially framed for intellectual pursuits, can only result in an extensive crop of useless if not positively dangerous prigs.

We cannot tell what arguments induced Lord Halifax to prefer a foreign education for his sons. It seems,

<sup>1</sup> See a very interesting article on 'An Eton Master' (Mr. Hale) in *Blackwood* of November 1891.

1674-75 however, practically certain that Henry Savile the younger had passed a year at Geneva<sup>1</sup> before matriculating at Christ Church, Oxford, April 11, 1674, at the age of thirteen.<sup>2</sup> In November, 1675, he was sent to Paris, under charge of a 'Governor' M. du Moulin,<sup>3</sup> where<sup>4</sup> he entered the 'Academy' of Foubert, one of the numerous schools of riding and gymnastics which abounded there, Foubert's establishment being specially frequented by Englishmen on account of his Protestantism. Whilst there, we find Mr. Savile by his father's desire studying French, Italian, fencing, singing, drawing; military evolutions formed another branch of his education; while Latin and English law, under the supervision of his tutor, occupied the mornings.

Here also we may perhaps mention that a year or two previously 'Lord Halifax' had moved from Lincoln's Inn Fields into a stately house which he had built for himself in the new and fashionable 'Piazza'—the beginning of the West End of London, now known as St. James's Square. The site of this fine mansion, which was known as Halifax House, lies north of King Street, and is at present divided between two houses, Nos. 17 and 18.<sup>5</sup> Here, within a stone's-throw of the Embassies and of half the political grandees,<sup>6</sup> he lived thenceforward.

The private affairs of Lord Halifax, however, have for the present sufficiently engaged our attention, and we must return to the political situation of 1674-75, in which a new element was rapidly developing.

<sup>1</sup> See *Savile Correspondence*, p. 37 (Henry Savile the elder to Lord Halifax, February 14, 1671, erroneously ascribed to 1673); Lord Sunderland to Lord Halifax, August 17, September 13 (no year given, but evidently 1672), *Spencer MSS.* 31 (20). He speaks of his nephew's presence in Paris on his way to that 'beastly Geneva,' and implores Halifax to let the boy remain with him in Paris. Henry Savile the elder (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 74), 1676, reminds his brother of the 'reproach you formerly lay under in England' of 'breeding your sons at so sanctified a place.'

<sup>2</sup> *Alumni Oxonienses*, p. 1319.

<sup>3</sup> The tutor's letters to Lord Halifax are at Devonshire House. A note to the letters of Dorothy Lady Sunderland (*Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 375) describes him as a 'French Protestant clergyman of the Church of England, who was a chaplain to Charles II. and a canon of Canterbury, where he died, in 1684.' But this man can hardly be identical with Mr. Savile's tutor, as he was eighty-four at the time of his death. (See Bell's *Fairfax Correspondence*, i. 123, &c.)

<sup>4</sup> His wife had died in Lincoln's Inn Fields, December 1670. Sir W. Coventry wrote to him at 'his House in St. James' Fields,' December 1672.

<sup>5</sup> Dasent, *History of St. James's Square*, pp. 18, 21, 22, 54, 240, 241.

<sup>6</sup> See the analysis of inhabitants in Dasent. 'We call it little London; and it outdoes . . . all the Squares, in dressing and breeding; may even the Court itself, under the rose' (Shadwell's *Bury Fair*, Act I., Sc. 1), quotation on Dasent's title-page.

The utter obliteration of the great 'Cabal' had left Sir Thomas Osborne—created successively Lord Latimer and Earl of Danby—complete master of the position. His rapid rise and the pre-eminence which he enjoyed naturally excited much jealousy; while the relations between him and his former associate, Lord Halifax, were marked by peculiar rancour. A man of remarkable though somewhat superficial parts,<sup>1</sup> he showed himself, despite a certain elementary patriotism, both grasping and unscrupulous—qualities which by no means impaired his efficiency for the task that awaited him: the creation, namely, of a Parliamentary majority.

At the moment when he assumed the direction of affairs the once enthusiastic Parliament of the Restoration, exasperated by the events of 1672, had rallied, as we know, almost unanimously round the 'Country' leaders. From February 1672 to the close of 1674 the Opposition constituted a large majority in the Lower House, and the power of prorogation seemed the only weapon remaining to the Government. It was Danby's cue, by dividing the forces of the Opposition to evolve from the political chaos a new Court party. In this endeavour his success equalled his dexterity. He renounced the policy of toleration, and so gained the more rigid Anglicans. Skillful flattery conciliated the discontented Cavalier remnant which nourished a bitter resentment against the compromise by which the Restoration had been effected. Nor was Danby unmindful of more material arguments. Places, pensions, direct bribes were dispensed with lavish profusion; and round the official and dependent element in the House of Commons, as round a nucleus, there soon gathered a body of adherents which, ere Danby had been eighteen months at the helm, began to assume proportions ominous for the Opposition. This change could not escape the notice of the 'Country' leaders. A new election appeared the only probable means of interrupting the reaction, and as early as February 1674<sup>2</sup> the hopes of the Opposition began to centre round a dissolution.

Danby, on the other hand, of course realised that the event thus eagerly desired by his opponents must eventually occur, with the almost certain result of annihilating

<sup>1</sup> His character has been well drawn by Shaftesbury (Christie, ii. 312). due allowance being made for the animus of an opponent. (See also Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 541.)

<sup>2</sup> See Shaftesbury's letter, already quoted.

1675 the tender Parliamentary plant which he had watered so assiduously.

He conceived, however, a simple yet effective method of manipulating the composition of either House, which he proceeded to develop in the session of 1675. He adopted—nay, improved, as against the Opposition—the tactics which that Opposition had employed against the Papists, and aimed at excluding the Country party by means of a Test Oath from political and official life.

The session in which this remarkable plan was developed opened<sup>1</sup> with a passage at arms in the Upper House. During the debate on the Address the Opposition Lords moved that thanks should be voted—not for ‘His Majesty’s most gracious speech,’<sup>2</sup> but for ‘the Gracious expressions in his Majesty’s speech.’ Their amendment was lost in favour of the original motion, upon which ten Lords, including Shaftesbury and Halifax, protested because ‘we think this manner of proceeding not so suitable with the Liberty of Debate necessary to this House.’<sup>3</sup> The incident, recalled by Lord Halifax in a speech of nearly twenty years later,<sup>4</sup> is prophetic of the sequel.

The ‘Test Oath,’ which the Court by Bill<sup>5</sup> introduced in the House of Lords, proposed to exact from all officials, all members of either House, and all Justices of the Peace, had been already imposed at the height of the Royalist reaction, though in the teeth of strong opposition,<sup>6</sup> upon all clergymen, all members of corporation, all Militia officers, and all Dissenting ministers desirous of residing within five miles of a former cure.<sup>7</sup>

It included (a) an assertion that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatever to take up arms against the King

<sup>1</sup> April 15, 1675. It is clear from two letters from Sir William Coventry to Thomas Thynne (*Longleat MSS.*, January 3, 23) that the session detained Halifax, who had hoped to leave town in March, ‘which is very early.’

<sup>2</sup> The King’s Speech, while expressing a zeal for religion, touched on the perennial necessities of the fleet, and directly intimated that the idea of dissolution was indefinitely postponed.

<sup>3</sup> *Lords’ Journal; Marvell Correspondence*, April 15 (Grosart’s edit.), ii. 135.

<sup>4</sup> See chapter xiii. The Commons, on the other hand, adopted the same form as that offered by the Country party in the Lords.

<sup>5</sup> ‘A Bill to prevent the Dangers which may arise from Persons disaffected to the Government.’

<sup>6</sup> See Clarendon, *Con. Hist.* ii. 134 (1827 edit.). Lord Southampton, one of the noblest of Cavaliers, had been as ardent in his dissent as Ashley himself. Nay, in 1665 an attempt to render the obligation universal had been frustrated by three votes, one being that of Osborne himself, at that time a supporter of Buckingham’s ‘tolerant’ policy, and another that of the friend who now at his behest introduced the Test Bill.

<sup>7</sup> See the Act of Uniformity; the Corporation, Militia, and Five-Mile Acts.

or those commissioned by him (in pursuance of such commission) or to take arms against his person in defence of his authority; (b) an oath that the swearer will never at any time attempt the alteration of the Government either in Church or State. It must be noticed that as, on the one hand, the *declaration* conveys a direct censure upon the surviving members of the old Presbyterian party, Shaftesbury himself at their head, so, on the other hand, it may be held to indemnify every form of official insult; while the *oath* can be extended to bar the most legitimate efforts at reform whether in Church or State. 1675

The Opposition Lords under the energetic leadership of Lord Shaftesbury determined on a vigorous resistance. Into the details of the long and arduous struggle,<sup>1</sup> interesting as they are, space forbids us to enter except so far as they elucidate the action of Lord Halifax. The second reading took place April 20; on the 21st the rejection of the Bill was moved upon the point of privilege.<sup>2</sup> The loss of this motion led twenty-three Peers, of whom Halifax was one, to record their protests on the ground that a legal forfeiture alone can disqualify a Peer for sitting in Parliament. The resolution to commit the Bill evoked a similar protest, in which, however, Halifax took no part; but a severe vote of censure on the protesting Lords, whose language had been somewhat acrimonious, called forth a third protest in favour of the Liberty of Protest, to which the signatures of twenty-one Peers, including Lord Halifax, are appended.

By May 3 the House had advanced to the detailed examination of the Bill in Committee. 'The first part, . . . ' says our reporter, 'that was fallen upon, was, "Whether there should be an Oath at all in the bill," and this was the only part the court party defended with reason. For the whole bill being to enjoin an oath, the house might reject it, but the Committee was not to destroy it. Yet the lord Halifax did, with that quickness, learning, and elegance, that are inseparable from all his

<sup>1</sup> Admirably given in the 'Letter to a Person of Quality,' often reprinted. It was long erroneously ascribed to Locke, in whose *Works* it is included (1812, vol. x. p. 233); but was almost certainly inspired, if not dictated, by Shaftesbury. It constitutes one of the earliest extant reports of the proceedings in the Upper House. See also *Lords' Journal*; the *Papers* of the House of Lords (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ix., part 2, p. 51, &c.); *Marrel's Correspondence*; and Macpherson's extracts from the *Memoirs of James II.* Christie gives a good abstract; also Lord John Russell (*Life of William Lord Russell*).

<sup>2</sup> Namely, that any test which tended to deprive Peers of their birth-right interfered with the privileges of the Upper House.

1675 discourses make appear, that as there really was no security to any state by oaths, so also no private person, much less statesman, would ever order his affairs as relying on it; no man would ever sleep with open doors, or unlocked-up treasure or plate, should all the town be sworn not to rob: so that the use of multiplying oaths had been most commonly to exclude or disturb some honest, conscientious men, who would never have prejudiced the government.' This speech has been described by Lord John Russell as the ablest contribution to the debate.<sup>1</sup>

It was further questioned by Halifax and others whether the imposition of an assertory oath in matters doctrinal does not involve an assumption of infallibility on the part of the imposing power; and whether the thirty-fourth and thirty-seventh verses of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, even if they are not held to forbid, according to the opinion of Grotius,<sup>2</sup> all promissory oaths, can be considered favourable to the multiplication of such awful engagements. These points, however, were ignored. The clause denying the lawfulness of resistance came under discussion four days later; it evoked a bold though guarded defence of that ultimate right as the one mark by which a limited can be distinguished from an absolute monarchy.

By May 12 the conflict raged round the ecclesiastical question, and the divine origin of Episcopacy was hotly argued between the bishops and what we may by anticipation describe as the Low Church party. Lord Wharton, 'upon the Bishop's claim to a Divine Right,' demanded 'Whether they then did not claim withal a power of excommunicating their prince?' They evaded the question on the plea that they had never exercised it. 'Upon which the lord Halifax told them "That that might well be; for since the Reformation, they had hitherto had too great a dependence on the crown to venture on that, or any other offence to it."'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Life of William Lord Russell.*

<sup>2</sup> *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, lib. ii. cap. 13.

<sup>3</sup> We may here call the attention of our readers to an abortive negotiation between the moderates of the Established Church and the Presbyterians relative to a proposed Act of comprehension, which extended through the winter and spring of 1674-75, and seems to have terminated about April. Tillotson and Stillingfleet were engaged, and were chiefly encouraged by Lords Halifax and Carlisle (Baxter's *Reliquæ*, part iii. p. 157. &c.). To this we may perhaps refer the allusion in *Poems on Affairs of State*, quoted in *Savile Correspondence*, p. 190, where the budding statesman remarks:—

'And that we may assume the Churches weal,  
And all Disorder in Religion heal,  
I will espouse Lord Hall's Zeal.'

By this time the strenuous efforts of the Opposition had introduced considerable modifications into the original measure.<sup>1</sup> That the Bill, though in a somewhat mutilated form, must have passed is a foregone conclusion; but this was prevented by an opportune quarrel between the Houses (so opportune, indeed, that Shaftesbury was suspected of fomenting it), which necessitated a prorogation, June 9.<sup>2</sup> 167

It is needless to dilate on the importance of this singular episode. It defined to an extraordinary degree the positions of the two parties, and the ample report of the debates laid before the public in the remarkable pamphlet<sup>3</sup> we have quoted constituted a valuable contribution to the political education of the provinces. Nor should we omit to notice how strongly Sir William Coventry had been moved by the new methods of securing Parliamentary support so extensively pursued at Court. A Bill by which Papists should have been excluded from either House received his support; and his speech on the Bill framed to exclude Placemen<sup>4</sup> from the House of Commons, which Bill he had perhaps originated, was unusually severe.<sup>5</sup> Nor did he fail, during the ensuing session, to stigmatise with equal severity the dishonest encouragement afforded by the English Government to the levy of English troops for the French service—an encouragement the more scandalous because Charles had recently accepted the position of mediator between the still contending

<sup>1</sup> The clause concerning the King's commission had received a limiting rider; specific mention was made of the 'Protestant' religion established; and the penalty of deprivation was replaced by a fine of 500*l*.

<sup>2</sup> During the entire session Halifax was absent from the House on one occasion only, June 5.

<sup>3</sup> It appeared during the course of the succeeding session. Its sheets were wet November 7, 1675 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ix. 66). It was first sold at 12*d.*, but the price rose to 20*s.*—perhaps after the House of Lords had ordered it to be burnt, November 8. A committee was appointed to investigate the matter the same day; neither Shaftesbury nor Halifax sat on it (*Lords' Journal*).

<sup>4</sup> Grey's *Debates*, iii. 56 and 178; also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 492.

<sup>5</sup> During the recess Lord Halifax was at Rufford; but we know nothing further concerning his proceedings (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 39, July 8, 1675). Henry Savile apologises for the delay in writing, 'where I have been I could find no post that went either to Rufford or Thornhill;' the letter proves that Halifax was in the country on business, while his wife remained in town awaiting the birth of a child. A letter of July 17 (p. 10) shows that he was expected at the end of the ensuing week. We may mention among the correspondence of this year a complimentary letter from Lord Essex, May 15, 1675 (*Bodleian MSS.*, Add. C. 33, f. 88), on the return of Major Radcliffe, whom Essex has found, according to the recommendation of Lord Halifax, 'a carefull dilligent Officer, & every way a very good Man.'



1675-76 Powers. The disgraceful key to the situation—the fact that the English King was directly in the pay of the French Court—had not, of course, become public property; but suspicion rose high, and Coventry did not hesitate to assert that, without vigilance on the part of Parliament, the country might find itself engaged, for the second time, in the French interest.<sup>1</sup>

Proceedings, however, were interrupted, much to his disgust, by the renewal of that ‘privilege’ quarrel between the Houses which had terminated the preceding session.<sup>2</sup> Some believed that the Court, alarmed at the energy of the Commons, had fomented, underhand, the dispute. Halifax, however (‘then,’ as our informant<sup>3</sup> remarks; ‘in the interest of my Lord Shaftesbury his uncle’), described the incident as a scheme of the Country Lords, who desired to force a dissolution. We gather that he, in common with Sir William Coventry, deprecated these tactics; the knight,<sup>4</sup> at any rate, adjured the Peers to postpone the quarrel, at least to the *immediate* exigencies of public business. Their obstinacy, however, induced a deadlock which rendered the recess a matter of imperative necessity; whereupon the ‘Country’ Lords, headed by Lord Mohun, proposed an address to the King praying him to *dissolve* rather than to prorogue.<sup>5</sup> The motion, for which Lord Halifax voted, was lost; and among the twenty-two ‘Country’ Peers who protested against this decision we find the names of both Halifax and Shaftesbury.<sup>6</sup> This spirited document criticised the unprecedented if not illegal term of existence which the Parliament had already enjoyed. It touched upon the inconveniences which necessarily resulted, and enlarged upon the invidious position of representatives who were practically perpetual. To this source the rise of faction was referred, and incidentally the existing deadlock, of which the proximate cause was rather disingenuously sought in the conduct of the Commons.

On the following Monday Charles prorogued, and some six weeks later Lord Halifax shared the fate which had overtaken his partners in Opposition—being expelled

<sup>1</sup> It was Coventry who carried up a note against the retention of English troops in the French service; and a motion to place a supply, already strictly appropriated to the support of the fleet, in third hands (which was lost by nine votes only), had his express sanction.

<sup>2</sup> 1675, winter session.

<sup>3</sup> Reresby (1875), p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> At a conference between the Houses, November 19.

<sup>5</sup> Nov. 20.

<sup>6</sup> See the division list (Papers of the House of Lords, Art. 338, *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ix., part 2, p. 79).

the Council.<sup>1</sup> His presence at the board had been long an anomaly. He was on the worst terms with both York and Danby; and Halifax, where he disliked, never spared either criticism or satire. During November, for instance,<sup>2</sup> one Tuzancey having complained that a priest had attempted to convert him by threats, Halifax had sarcastically requested that his Majesty would permit the Protestants similar tactics as against the Papists, since they promised to prove effectual. The sarcasm, however, which actually procured his dismissal seems to have been directed against Lord Danby. Early in January 167 $\frac{5}{6}$  a charge of pecuniary corruption which concerned the Treasurer was brought before the Privy Council. A witness described an attempt to bribe the Minister and its eventual collapse. Lord Halifax hereupon cynically observed that the Treasurer appeared to have rejected the offer very mildly, and not so as to discourage a second attempt, which was, he remarked, as if a man should ask for his neighbour's wife and meet with a civil refusal.<sup>3</sup>

The taunt struck home. January 7, 167 $\frac{5}{6}$ , 'Lords Halifax and Holles were put out of the Council, and no cause was assigned for so doing.'<sup>4</sup> To this circumstance, and an illness which almost immediately ensued, we owe the following letter from Sir John Reresby. His early acquaintance<sup>5</sup> with Lord Halifax, due to the exigences of local business, had been cemented during the spring session of 1675, when Sir John, in the Country interest, had taken his seat for one of the Yorkshire boroughs:—

As Cowards My Lord dar not open their Eyes till y<sup>e</sup> danger be past, I durst not soe much as enquire after your Health, till I heard of y<sup>r</sup> Recoverie: Far from that I was afeard of every Letter I received, Knowing that ill newes flys fast from all hands wher soe many have a Concerne My L<sup>d</sup> For your Politicke misfortunes, y<sup>a</sup> have some freinds that bear soe great a share of them (for your own sake) that I am confident y<sup>e</sup> Remainder cannot be very grievous to y<sup>r</sup> Lord<sup>sh</sup> Nor can I

<sup>1</sup> He seems to have attended pretty regularly. See Henry Savile to his brother, July 17, 1675, 'every Wednesday you may show your parts at Hampton Court,' where the Council met when the Court was at Windsor.

<sup>2</sup> Letter of William Fall, November 9 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 467a).

<sup>3</sup> Burnet. The charge related to Ireland. Danby had been often accused of corruption, and we imagine justly.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* i. 19.

<sup>5</sup> The earlier letters of Sir John to Lord Halifax are marked by rather effusive adulation. See *Bodleian MSS.*, Rawlinson D. 204, ff. 1, 3, 13: letter book, &c., of Sir John Reresby (letters of February 10, 1669, and November 17, 1674).

1676 compliment y<sup>r</sup> Lord<sup>sh</sup> in telling y<sup>u</sup> that they maik trouble in that regard.

J. R.<sup>1</sup>

This incident must have intensified, if possible, the animosity between Halifax and Lord Danby, which attracted a considerable share of public attention. A letter is extant written to the Treasurer during the year 1676<sup>2</sup> by some friend or dependent<sup>3</sup> who professes to relate a conversation with the Earl of Shaftesbury. His version of the situation is curious. Shaftesbury, according to him, spoke of Danby with apparent friendship, and blamed Coventry<sup>4</sup> for caballing 'with Lords Halifax and Winchester,' the 'professed enemies' of the Treasurer. The object of these cabals is said to be the disgrace of Danby and his friends, and the substitution of Sir William and his 'party' in the highest offices of the State; a consummation, says our informant, highly repugnant to the ex-Chancellor, who dreads nothing more than the elevation of Coventry to the Treasury.

We attach little importance to this gossip,<sup>5</sup> but it certainly shows—first, that in public opinion the enmity between Halifax and Danby was peculiarly inveterate; secondly, that the 'Country party' included at least two sections, the followers of Coventry and Halifax, and the direct adherents of Shaftesbury; while it confirms our previous opinion, that the relations between the first two and the last-mentioned politician were not absolutely amicable. The events of the following session,<sup>6</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> Letter book (*Bodleian MSS.*, Rawlinson D. 204, f. 206): 'Feb: ye 25: 75. To my Lord Hallifax After his Recoverie from a dangerous sickness and his Being put out of the Privie Councell For his being against Arbitrary proceedings both ther and in Parl<sup>mt</sup>' ('as he pretended.' This was added later). For his illness, see Lady Russell's *Letters* (edit. 1819), February 10, 1676, p. 180; and a letter of February 8 in the Longleat collection.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax stayed in London much of the year (Sir William Coventry to Thomas Thynne, July 3, also Aug. 2, 1676). He supposes Halifax has given up all thoughts of going North, 'though (being ashamed to confesse it.) he still talkes of going, but cannot yett sett the time.' He was certainly in town August 15, when he dined with Evelyn (*Diary*, edit. 1879, ii. 321).

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi, part 7, p. 12. The writer is said to be a Mr. Kingdon; it is not dated. The *Memoirs* of Danby mentions a Mr. Kingdon in relation to Treasury business. One Lemuel Kingdon represented Hull, 1679, on the recommendation of Danby's enemy, the Duke of Monmouth (Grosart's *Murrell*, ii. 642).

<sup>4</sup> And Ormonde.

<sup>5</sup> It seems incredible that Shaftesbury should have sought a reconciliation with Danby, or that anything could have induced Coventry, whose health had long declined, to resume office.

<sup>6</sup> 1676-77.

succeeded a prorogation of fourteen months, strengthens yet further our conviction. 1679

The Opposition in the House of Lords had prepared for battle on a somewhat curious issue—the theory that Parliament, owing to the length of the prorogation, was *ipso facto* dissolved.<sup>1</sup>

The suggestion, though founded on a legal quibble, was endorsed by Shaftesbury with characteristic vehemence as a means of forcing the King's hand. Others, however, foresaw that the attempt to assert this doctrine would arouse so strong a resentment, even among the Country minority in the Lower House,<sup>2</sup> as must materially strengthen the Government. Lord Halifax, supported by Lord Winchester,<sup>3</sup> set himself, says Burnet, energetically to oppose the design; 'and did it not without expressing great sharpness against lord Shaftesbury, who could not be managed in this matter.' The remonstrances of Halifax were, in fact, vain; and on February 15, after Charles had met his Parliament with the usual professions and the usual demands for money, Buckingham, who ranked once more with the Country party, threw the bomb. He was supported by Shaftesbury and two others.<sup>4</sup> Halifax, after marshalling the arguments in favour of the motion, decided against it; Holles sat silent; and the rest of the House not only rejected the suggestion with indignation,<sup>5</sup> but summarily committed to the Tower the four recalcitrant Peers.<sup>6</sup>

Against this arbitrary proceeding, however, Lord Halifax vigorously protested; and Burnet gives an abstract of the arguments employed by the Viscount and his supporters, in which we can, without difficulty, trace the sarcastic wit of the principal speaker.

'They said, if an idle motion was made, and checked at first, he that made it might be censured for it, though it was seldom, if ever, to be practised in a free council, *where every man was not bound to be wise, nor to make no impertinent motion*: but when the motion was entertained, and a debate followed, and a question was put upon

<sup>1</sup> Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 229-234.

<sup>2</sup> The dissolution, of course, practically affected the Lower House alone; and the jealousy at the moment existing between the Houses was certain to be fanned into flame by anything which resembled interference on the part of the Upper House.

<sup>3</sup> Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 84 (from the *Memoirs* of James II. himself). The inclusion of Holles appears incorrect. (See Burnet, ii. 109-10.)

<sup>4</sup> Salisbury and Wharton.

<sup>5</sup> All this from Runke, who probably quotes the despatches of the French Ambassador.

<sup>6</sup> On their refusal to beg the pardon of the House, February 16 and 17.

1677 it, it was destructive to the freedom of public councils, to call any one to an account for it: they<sup>1</sup> might with the same justice call them to an account for their debates and votes: so that no man was safe, unless he could know where the majority would be; here would be a precedent to tip down so many lords at a time, and to garboil the house, as often as any party should have a great majority.' As matters stood, in fact, the Country party, despite remonstrances, in which Lord Halifax took part,<sup>2</sup> lost during the entire session the services of four prominent members; while Shaftesbury, the most refractory of the victims, actually remained in the Tower a whole year.<sup>3</sup>

In the Lower House, where the question had been more delicately raised, and where Sir William had characteristically declared for freedom of debate, while reserving his own decision, the consequences deprecated by Halifax soon became apparent. Public feeling in that House was exasperated against the authors of the unpopular motion and the party to which they belonged.<sup>4</sup> At this

<sup>1</sup> The Court party.

<sup>2</sup> He with Lord Clarendon seconded the motion of Lord Delamere for the release by favour of the four Lords confined upon a punctilio. The motion dropped after a heated debate which had nearly ended in the committal of Delamere (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 469). The name of Halifax does not occur in the *Journal* among the visitors of the imprisoned Lords, but the entries are imperfect, many having been cancelled under a subsequent vote of the House. As a matter of fact, he received the requisite permission in common with Winchester, Dorset, Stamford, and Stafford (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii. part 7, p. 133).

<sup>3</sup> Lord Halifax was a member of the Committee appointed February 16, the day of Shaftesbury's committal, to inquire into certain pamphlets which had endorsed his view of the dissolution question, and into libels in general. The evidence of *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* ix., part 2, p. 69 &c. is extremely interesting. The whole question of licensing is discussed, as the pamphlets had been unlicensed. The state of the law (under an Act of 1662) appears to have been as follows: Printing remained a monopoly of the Stationers' Company. None but the members of that Company could lawfully print or publish; nor could such a member do so without the imprimatur of the official licensers. These were the Chancellor &c. for law books; certain bishops for divinity, physic, and philosophy; the Secretary of State for history and politics; &c. In practice, however, L'Estrange, the well-known pamphleteer—originally, it would seem, an agent of the Secretary's office—appeared to exercise the functions of a general censor. Between him and the Company there was a standing feud. They accused him of corruption; he accused the Company of conniving, from political motives, at seditious literature. Eventually the Committee recommended a more stringent licensing Act, proceedings upon which were interrupted by the prorogation. The matter is of interest, since it shows that the question of licensing, of the law of libel, and of anonymous publication generally, had been brought before Lord Halifax in a very prominent manner. We seem to trace the result in the anonymous character and guarded language of his own subsequent pamphlets.

<sup>4</sup> On the motion for a naval supply the Court obtained exactly double the amount proposed by William Coventry.

moment, however, the question of foreign policy, which suddenly reached an acute stage, roused the dormant patriotism even of many among the Court party. For nearly eighteen months--until the Popish plot revelations--it constituted the absorbing political topic, to the exclusion of more domestic issues.

The five years' contest between France and the confederacy under William of Orange had come to a crisis. The fortune of war seemed definitely against the confederates; and in England the general fear lest Charles should throw his weight into the French scale<sup>1</sup> was accompanied by a wish no less strong that he should side with Holland. The urgency of William Coventry<sup>2</sup> is specially remarkable; and the continued success of Louis both in Flanders and in Sicily called forth from the Commons an address recommendatory of a breach with France. Charles demanded 600,000*l.* as the preliminary of action; the Commons, at the instance of William Coventry, very prudently declined to authorise a loan for more than 200,000*l.*; and thus matters remained at the beginning of the Easter recess.<sup>3</sup>

Lord Halifax spent the holidays at Rufford; while Harry Savile, for once in his life, was more arduously occupied. As already intimated, the career of that lively personage had been for some years remarkably chequered.

Extravagant tastes, a flippant wit, and extremely convivial habits had involved him in perpetual embarrassments, pecuniary and other. Convinced that 'our measures now at court are so taken, that it is essential to a man's succeeding there to be of the parl<sup>mt</sup>,'<sup>4</sup> the erratic courtier, whose earlier attempts had proved futile,<sup>5</sup> now stood for Newark in the Treasurer's interest.<sup>6</sup> A ludicrous incident<sup>7</sup> had nearly ruined his chances; but eventually,

<sup>1</sup> Grey's *Debates*, iv. 120, 128, 131, 138.

- *Ibid.* passim.

<sup>2</sup> For the part taken by Lord Halifax during this session in an attempt to assert for the Lords, as well as the Commons, the right to receive accounts of public money, see *Lords' Journal*, April 11-14, 16. He probably originated the eventual compromise (namely, an address to the King, saving the rights of the Peers and ascribing the immediate concession to a sense of the exigencies of public business), as he was appointed to draw up the address in conjunction with the Lords Treasurer, Privy Seal, and High Steward.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 45, April 16.

<sup>4</sup> See Grey's *Debates*, iii. 93, 187; iv. 297-304; *Savile Correspondence*, p. 46, note; Hallam, ii. 204.

<sup>5</sup> For the friendly relations between Savile and Danby, see in Macaulay the curious and not very creditable story related by the latter (*History of England* (1858), vol. iv. p. 560).

<sup>7</sup> The House of Commons, anxious to stay the abuse of 'treating,'

1677 after an awful week of unlimited 'good ale and ill sack,' the witty candidate found himself, to his ingenuous delight,<sup>1</sup> senior member for the borough. When, however, at the conclusion of the recess, he took his seat, May 23, his elder brother (whether detained by private business or in correct anticipation of an extremely brief session does not appear) remained, to the general astonishment,<sup>2</sup> in the country. His absence seemed the more surprising since the continued imprisonment of the four Lords had already weakened the Opposition in the Upper House. His friends, however, sent regular reports during the five days' session which ensued. The interval of Parliament had been utilised for intrigue (largely, one fears, of a pecuniary nature) by the representatives both of France and the Allies; and the correspondence of William Coventry,<sup>3</sup> at Longleat, shows the anxiety with which he regarded the crisis, and his efforts to secure a large attendance. On May 23 Charles, in his opening speech, announced, on the word of a King, that if the Houses would give him 600,000*l.* it should be spent for the good of the kingdom. Probably on the motion of William Coventry, the Commons refused the money until alliances with the Dutch and others should have been definitely declared.<sup>4</sup>

which the political excitement of the few preceding years and increased number of election contests had generated, had recently passed a vote by which 'treating' to an extent exceeding the modest sum of 10*l.* should have vitiated any election. The Newark men, however, saw no reason why legislative virtue should deprive a willing constituency of cakes and ale; they ascribed the obnoxious vote to Harry's interest with his uncle (William?), carried about a grotesque effigy of the 'Ten-Pound Burgess,' and would have burnt it but for the intervention of the authorities. So poor Harry was forced into a wholesale transgression of the salutary restriction (Grey's *Debates*, iv. 4, 96, 98; *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 43-46, 54, 55, and notes).

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat chequered by the ensuing bill of 100*l.* A delightful letter of May 8 implores his brother, in mock-pathetic terms, to cultivate the good graces of the worthy electors (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 46-48).

<sup>2</sup> See *Savile Correspondence* (Henry Savile to Halifax, May 10, 12). 'The example of so eminent a person as yourself does prevail upon others of the nobility, so that L<sup>d</sup> Gray of Wark goes down into Northumberland on Wednesday with his family for all summer, and when I asked him why he would go so near the parl<sup>mt</sup> he told me, surely he was not so necessary there as my Lord Halifax' (p. 53). 'Your . . . absence from this sessions is a miracle to all the world' (May 17, p. 55). Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Lord Halifax, May 24 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [11]; second volume of *Savile Correspondence* transcript), says, 'I have heard nothing of your Brother, but as soon as he came into the House he placed himself between his two uncles, to keep them from going too much of either side with his prudence.'

<sup>3</sup> With Thomas Thynne.

<sup>4</sup> Sir William to Lord Halifax, May 24 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]); Coventry's own speech (Grey's *Debates* and *Parliamentary History*); and Dorothy Lady Sunderland, as above.

'I heare,' writes Thomas Thynne to his cousin, Lord Halifax,<sup>1</sup> 'our carrying the vote for ye naming Holland to bee an Allie, much displeased the Court,<sup>2</sup> at ye Cabinet the D.<sup>3</sup> moved to have us dissolved, others prorogued, but ye, more moderate Councillis prevailed, soe y<sup>t</sup> wee shall have an answer, but most thinke a rough one, w<sup>ch</sup> in ye temper we are, will worke little, the Country Gentlemen being very soure, & displeased' (;) 'upon ye division of ye House, severall of ye Court went w<sup>th</sup> us as Sackville, S<sup>r</sup> Fra. Compton, S<sup>r</sup> H. Ford, S<sup>r</sup> J<sup>n</sup> Elwaies, and all ye Speaker's friends, whom most thinke at present opposite to L. Treas<sup>r</sup>, he and L<sup>d</sup> Ormond are at greate odds, and tis belieyed the Duke and he (L. T.) are not friends. Upon our denying money, ye D. said he thought the Fr. Amb<sup>as</sup> had bribed us to serve his M<sup>r</sup>. and y<sup>t</sup> ye K<sup>s</sup> would ruine the Royall family if he made warr upon France at this time, ye exposition whereof yu can easily make,' &c.

'S<sup>r</sup> H. Goodrick and S<sup>r</sup> Jn. Ceresby<sup>1</sup> have openly left us.'

On the following day Charles returned a severe answer to the address, and peremptorily adjourned.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Member for Tamworth in the 'Country' interest (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [51], May 27, 1677). Its more confidential character is explained by the fact that it was sent privately by the carrier.

<sup>2</sup> The motion had been supported by Sir William, and was carried by 182 to 142, forty or fifty members abstaining.

<sup>3</sup> Of York (?).

<sup>4</sup> The political conversion of Sir John had taken place during the preceding session, and is ingenuously described in his celebrated *Memoirs*. Charles and the Treasurer played upon his vanity by unusual condescensions, and completed the process by a few well-timed aspersions on the sincerity of the Country leaders (*Memoirs*, p. 107).

<sup>5</sup> Described in a letter of William Coventry, which, though it adds no fresh information to that which is available in Marvell, Grey's *Debates*, &c., illustrates the relations between Halifax and Coventry, with their political standpoint. It is dated May 29, 1677, and will be found among the *Spencer MSS.* 31 (25): 'The manner of it was thus. In the morning when the Speaker tooke ye chaire The Secretary' (H. Coventry) 'told us the K<sup>e</sup> commanded our attendance on himself at the Banqueting house immediately; where, when the House was come, the K<sup>e</sup> told them their addresse was long and weighty, & therefore he had committed his answer to writing; w<sup>ch</sup> he read, and then gave it to the Speaker, I cannot send you any copy, nor will I adventure to repeat any broken parts of it (having only heard it once read) but in the maine it was a reprehension to us for meddling with peace & warre, w<sup>ch</sup> did not belong to us, upon w<sup>ch</sup> his Ma: insisted a good deale, & pretty home. That being read the Speaker told us his Ma: had also commanded that the house should adjourne till ye 16 July, omitting the word immediately, w<sup>ch</sup> in his next repetition (when some stood up to speake) hee supplied; & would have adjourned the house but hee was told it could not bee w<sup>th</sup> out a question, but hee finding some men seeme earnest, to prevent debate, declared the house adjourned till July 16, & soe went out of the chaire, & soe out of the house, some crying out in a confused manner that ye house was not adjourned. Since



1677-8

Lord Halifax remained at Rufford during the rest of the summer, and his friends kept him well supplied with family and political intelligence.<sup>1</sup> It was thus he learned what action was taken by the Lords in the Tower, and how Bentinck, favourite of the Prince of Orange, had arrived on a special secret mission.<sup>2</sup> Politically the juncture was critical; for the Government could not ignore, despite its resentment, the attitude Parliament had taken in relation to foreign affairs. Charles indeed renewed during August his secret engagements with France;<sup>3</sup> but he had already begun to waver, when in September, about the time Lord Halifax returned to town,<sup>4</sup> the Prince himself came over.

His allies were greatly alarmed, fearing he might desert them;<sup>5</sup> in England curiosity rose high.<sup>6</sup> The Treasurer, who had always disliked the intrigues with France—to which, notwithstanding, he had lent a dishonourable assistance—employed all his influence in favour of the young Dutchman. On October 24 the approaching marriage of William and his cousin, the Lady Mary, was officially announced;<sup>7</sup> and this matrimonial alliance at the moment represented a real political approximation. Charles had, in fact, practically, though not openly, broken with France; and when in January 1677 he once more confronted his Parliament,<sup>8</sup> the excitement in England<sup>9</sup> and

that, some say the Speaker omitted some what w<sup>h</sup> the K<sup>x</sup> said, viz. that he did not intend our sitting July 16. unlesse some extraordinary occasion required it. . . . I forgott to tell you (when I was upon the adjournment) that the L<sup>d</sup> interpreted it another way, & dispatched businesse after the message to them, & then adjourned themselves.

<sup>1</sup> See Henry Savile (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 57-66) and Thomas Thynne (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [51]). *Tongleat MSS.* and *Savile Correspondence* show that Henry and Lord Windsor went down to Rufford, but that Sir William's health precluded so long a journey.

<sup>2</sup> See Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 603; Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Lord Halifax, letter of June 12, 1677, *Spencer MSS.* (Letter Book, 31 [11]).

<sup>3</sup> He undertook, in consideration of a pension of 200,000*l.*, to prorogue the obnoxious Parliament till April 1678.

<sup>4</sup> To his house in St. James's Fields (now St. James's Square). Lord Windsor describes it as large and airy.

<sup>5</sup> Du Moulin to Lord Halifax, November 13, 1677. On the authority of the Spanish Ambassador at Rome, where Du Moulin and his pupil were now established.

<sup>6</sup> 'The Prince of Orange's visit,' writes Thomas Thynne from the country, October 6, 'fills us all with discourse, the vulgar proclaime love and marriage, the more discerning Treaties and Peace' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [51]).

<sup>7</sup> The young lady was not, curiously enough, at this time heiress-presumptive to the crown. A half-brother was born within a few days of her marriage, to whom her husband stood godfather, but who died about a month later (*Hatton Correspondence*, i. 154).

<sup>8</sup> This marks the breach with Louis, who had just stopped the pension in return for which Charles had promised to prorogue till April.

<sup>9</sup> See Thomas Thynne to Lord H., December 9, 1677 (*Spencer MSS.*).

on the Continent<sup>1</sup> became intense. Yet, though he had 1678 definitely thrown his weight into the scale so ardently desired by the Country party, his well-known duplicity rendered it impossible for him to convince the majority that his action was sincere.<sup>2</sup> The French Ambassador, moreover, strained every nerve to influence that section of the Country party, headed by Shaftesbury in the Lords and the famous Lord Russell in the Commons, to which foreign politics, as compared with domestic exigences, seemed insignificant. Between these strange contracting parties<sup>3</sup> an understanding eventually took place. M. Barillon was empowered to engage his master's credit that if the efforts of the Parliamentary leaders should avert a war between the kingdoms, Louis would exert all his influence at the English Court to procure a dissolution, the reduction of the forces raised for the war, and the ruin of Danby, upon whom France burned to avenge the marriage of Princess Mary. In this unstatesmanlike intrigue neither Halifax nor Sir William Coventry was involved; we imagine, indeed, that neither was aware of its progress. During the session which ensued, both,<sup>4</sup> it is certain, advocated a war with France. Their policy, however,

31 [51]): 'This late unexpected change . . . I suppose . . . appeared not so strange to you as to us at distance . . . if it shall please God to incline his Ma<sup>ty</sup> to concur with his people, they of the country seeme not to bee afraide of war, nor what is the necessary concomitant of war, taxes; so universal is their dread of the growth of France.' He asks for the private opinion of Lord Halifax, and promises a trustworthy messenger shall await the letter.

<sup>1</sup> M. du Moulin to Lord Halifax, Rome, January 19; February 9 (Henry Savile has dined with the French Ambassador, who complained bitterly of the King of England); March 16 the young man and his 'Governour' have an audience of the Pope, who 'askt us if wee intended to returne into England through France, wee said wee believed wee should if the warre betwixt England and France did not hinder us, he assured us then that there would be no warre, though all here are of another opinion except the French Embassadour.' In Venice the question was debated with equal vigour (letter of April 22).

<sup>2</sup> Even avowed courtiers suspected his sincerity on the point. (See Reresby.)

<sup>3</sup> For this celebrated intrigue, see Dalrymple; Christie's *Shaftesbury*; and Russell's *Russell*. Money was lavished on corrupt members of the party, but neither Shaftesbury nor Russell is responsible for this discreditable feature of the transaction. Their motives will bear inspection, though their policy does not.

<sup>4</sup> As regards Sir William, see Temple's *Memoirs*, ii. 477 (1679): 'Sir William Coventry had the most credit of any man in the house of Commons, and, I think, the most deservedly, not only for his great abilities, but for having been turned out of the council and treasury to make way for my Lord Clifford's greatness, and the designs of the cabal. He had been ever since opposite to the French alliance, and bent upon engaging England in a war with that crown, and assistance of the confederates.' (See also Grey's *Debates*, *passim*.) For Halifax, see Henry Savile, *Savile*

1678 was frustrated by the suspicions of half the party, and by the deliberate tactics of the rest.

Baffled by this unexpected opposition, Charles acted with even more than his ordinary unscrupulous vacillation.<sup>1</sup> At one moment he was secretly negotiating, not without the unwilling co-operation of Danby, a renewed pension treaty with France; the next he was despatching auxiliary forces to the assistance of the Allies. France now saw that a peace offered the only possible solution; and suddenly, July 31, the six years' war and three years' negotiation between France and Holland ended in the Treaty of Nimeguen. The battle of Mons, fought by the Prince of Orange and his English reinforcements ere he had received notice of the peace, seemed to reopen the question; but in September the ratification finally passed.<sup>2</sup> Bitter was the mortification of William Coventry, who—dejected by failure, by advancing years, and by increasing ill-health—began once more to talk of retiring from active Parliamentary life.<sup>3</sup>

The peace of Nimeguen marks the close of an interlude. With the succeeding session domestic affairs again resumed the ascendant; and we shall watch the development of three episodes destined to revolutionise the political situation. These are the so-called Popish plot revelations, with their effect on the prospects and position of the Duke of York; the successful attack on Treasurer Danby; and the political evolution of the Duke of Monmouth, which was connected with both incidents.

*Correspondence*, p. 73, September 21: 'I will . . . conclude yourself and all such anti-courtiers as you are, so convinced of the peace that new measures must be taken by all such as grounded their politicks upon the continuance of the war.' (In the *Savile Correspondence* the comma is placed after 'anti-courtiers' instead of 'as you are,' which makes nonsense.) Neither Halifax nor Coventry is so much as mentioned at this period in the extremely detailed despatches of the French Ambassador. (See Dalrymple and Christie.) The difference between Halifax and Shaftesbury at this juncture is the more remarkable because we find Lord Halifax visiting him at the Tower, employing on his behalf a proxy, and presenting his petition to the House of Lords (Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 257; *Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 6). Shaftesbury was released upon full submission, February 26, 1677.

<sup>1</sup> We notice between March and July at least five fluctuations of policy.

<sup>2</sup> As Lord Halifax remained in town after the prorogation of July, he became the great oracle of his Country friends at this epoch (letters of Thomas Thynne and Sir William Coventry, *Spencer MSS.*).

<sup>3</sup> Sir William to Lord Halifax, August 11, 19, 25, September 8 (*Spencer MSS.* 31\* [25]). The letter of August 25 says: 'The mortalities hitherto come to my knowledge have bin only of ye country party, soe that the contention is like to bee every day more unequall and to less purpose.'

I. The depositions of the notorious Titus Oates<sup>1</sup> were never officially mentioned till the opening of Parliament. Accident, however, early revealed their import to Gilbert Burnet, a young Scotch Episcopalian of remarkable gifts, unusual attainments, and exemplary moderation, who corresponded with the Scotch malcontents<sup>2</sup> and ranked among the most popular of London preachers.<sup>3</sup> Through him the story reached the Country leaders, with whom Burnet was specially intimate. The greater part, he tells us, derided the story, which they regarded in the light of a mare's-nest deliberately manufactured by the Government in order to avert the charge of Popery. 'But lord Halifax,' says Burnet, 'when I told him of it, had another apprehension of it. He said, considering the suspicions all people had of the duke's religion, he believed every discovery of that sort would raise a flame, which the court would not be able to manage.' His prophecy was abundantly justified, for rumour—reinforced by the mysterious death of the magistrate Godfrey and the arrest of Coleman, a former secretary of the Duchess of York—had inspired a frenzy of terror, even before the general excitement had received an official sanction.

The investigation of the affair occupied the Lords during the greater part of the session. Lord Halifax, whom Burnet ranks among the four<sup>4</sup> leaders of the Upper House, was actively engaged. 'None,' says James II., 'so violent a driver of it as he.'<sup>5</sup>

This statement, however, must be accepted with reservations. It is certain that Halifax, during several years, assumed the substantial truth of a legend which was at first accepted, with horrified credulity, by politicians of every shade.<sup>6</sup> Much to his discredit, moreover,

<sup>1</sup> September 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 2, p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> He had settled there after a breach with Lauderdale, who in the days when he had supported the moderate Episcopalians had patronised Burnet.

<sup>5</sup> The other three were Shaftesbury, Buckingham, and Lord Essex.

<sup>6</sup> Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 141. See *Lords' Journal*, October 24, November 1, 11, 23, 26, December 7, 12, 16; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, pp. 46, 49, 75; *Brit. Mus. Add. MSS.* 32,095 (123); *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* v. 318, xiv. part 4, p. 108; North's *Examen*, p. 147. These references show the Committees on which he sat. He is not made responsible for the cruel treatment meted to one Caryll by a Committee of the House (Bell's *Fairfax Correspondence*, ii. 301).

<sup>6</sup> Henry Coventry and Sir William appear to have accepted the story implicitly. Macaulay and Ranke have ably demonstrated that the idea was, on the face of it, by no means improbable. The fault of the Country party lay rather in the tenacity with which it clung to the fiction long after it had been exploded in the opinion of unprejudiced persons.

1678 he<sup>1</sup> seems to have been one of the five peers who countenanced the disgraceful attempt to implicate the Queen. Burnet, however, gives us clearly to understand that the Viscount deprecated the institution of *criminal* proceedings on the authority of witnesses so abandoned;<sup>2</sup> and his statement is confirmed by the fact that upon the only occasion on which Halifax was required to consider the matter from a judicial point of view he voted for an acquittal. Nor must we omit to notice, though the circumstance now for the first time transpires, that he opposed the Bill by which Papists were excluded from the House, and which remained upon the statute book during 150 years, the sole substantial result of the Great Panic.<sup>3</sup> His action on this point, which cost him some popularity, was at once consistent with his own previous declarations<sup>4</sup> and an act of justice to a body of Peers many of whom during several years had reinforced the Country party.<sup>5</sup>

From the scope of this Bill the Heir-Presumptive with difficulty obtained his own exemption by a promise of absenting himself from Council.<sup>6</sup> It is needless to

<sup>1</sup> With Shaftesbury, Wharton, Grey, Herbert (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, xii., part 9, p. 82).

<sup>2</sup> Burnet's story is as follows: Himself convinced that a widespread Roman Catholic intrigue had been in agitation, he yet entertained the lowest opinion of Oates, and remonstrated with the Country leaders concerning the impropriety of capital prosecutions on his testimony. Holles, he said, showed more 'temper' (moderation) than might have been expected from a man of his heat. 'Lord Halifax was of the same mind. But the earl of Shaftesbury could not bear the discourse. He said, we must support the evidence; and that all those who undermined the credit of the witnesses were to be looked on as public enemies,' ii. 164.

<sup>3</sup> This fact becomes evident in rather a curious manner. The Bill met with opposition in the House of Lords during the Committee stage. (See the subversive amendments reported but rejected by the House, *Lords' Journal*.) In the Lower House some very unparliamentary reflections were cast upon this alleged obstruction (November 16). Secretary Coventry remonstrated, on which Mr. Bennett, secretary and confidant of Lord Shaftesbury, retorted, 'I will not enquire into the Lords' actions; but when men of that House talk high without doors, and within are for Popery!' (*sic*). The reporter intimates that the taunt was directed against Lord Halifax (*Grey's Debates*, vi. 206). His opposition to this Bill is the more remarkable because it seems to have secured the support of Sir William, who had also patronised earlier attempts in the same direction. (See *ante*.)

<sup>4</sup> During the debates on the Test Bill of 1675, he, in common with his party, had protested against the doctrine that a Peer should be deprived of his hereditary right by anything short of legal forfeiture.

<sup>5</sup> It is stated that Shaftesbury had pledged the faith of the Country party to the Papist Lords for the maintenance of their hereditary right, in return for their opposition to Danby's Test. This pledge, if so, he now broke.

<sup>6</sup> *Dutch Despatches*, November  $\frac{5}{15}$ . Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888. f. 219.

dilate on the sinister aspect which he naturally assumed 1678 in the light of revelations which presupposed his succession as the desired result of his brother's murder. Addresses for his removal from the King's presence and councils emanated from either House,<sup>1</sup> and despite the King's public intimation<sup>2</sup> that while ready to concur in arrangements for the security of the Protestant religion under a Popish successor he should veto any *interference* with the succession, a creature of Lord Shaftesbury<sup>3</sup> dared obviously to insinuate<sup>4</sup> the advisability of an *exclusion*.<sup>5</sup>

II. The organised and successful attack upon the Treasurer which must next detain our attention was both instigated and equipped by the malice of a disappointed courtier. Ralph Montague, who had for some years represented English interests at Versailles, attributed his recall to the Treasurer's influence. Corrupt and unscrupulous, he determined to revenge himself by betraying to Parliament the pecuniary intrigues with France in which Danby had been implicated; and, aware that Louis desired the ruin of the Minister by whom the unpatriotic commerce had been eventually broken, he managed to obtain a pension of £1,500 a year from the French Court in consideration of his contemplated treachery. This detail he naturally suppressed when, on his arrival in England, he communicated his projects to the Country leaders.<sup>6</sup> Lord Halifax was one of the first initiated, and it has been asserted, but we believe quite erroneously, that he was not only aware of the collusion between Montague and Barillon, the French Ambassador, but even participated in it. This statement is made by Sir John Dalrymple on the authority of Barillon's own despatches. Sir John, however, gives us in this connection a mere

<sup>1</sup> Shaftesbury made the motion in the Upper House; Halifax concurred (*Dutch Secret Despatches*, November 5; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 471; Von Ranke, v. 83; Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 543). Lord Russell moved it in the Lower House; the secretary deprecated the step, as the Duke by his account had already offered to withdraw (Grey's *Debates*, vi. 134; but see the *Life of James II.*, i. 525), and Sir William chivalrously defended his former master (Grey, vi. 249). Russell made an unusually able speech on the motion for the Duke's withdrawal (Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 542).

<sup>2</sup> November 9.

<sup>3</sup> Bennett.

<sup>4</sup> November 28.

<sup>5</sup> Even the Speaker and Sir W. Coventry began to talk of 'taking defences in church and state and power to dispose of the public revenue and militia' from a Popish successor.

<sup>6</sup> He had married a sister-in-law of Russell (Lady Northumberland, Harry Savile's former flame), and this, of course, gave him an obvious channel of communication with the Country party.

1678 synopsis of the originals, and we are convinced (though nothing but an examination of the original documents can prove our contention) that by a very natural error Dalrymple has credited Lord Halifax with a correspondence of which he was really the unconscious tool. The scrupulous care with which Halifax through life abstained from courting foreign interference, the special antagonism which he always displayed towards France, renders Dalrymple's interpretation from the first a suspicious one, and a curious circumstance strengthens our conviction. In a very bitter diatribe against Montague, written by Halifax some years later, he mentions as a current suspicion the secret understanding between the ex-Ambassador and France on this occasion. It seems impossible that he should have drawn attention to the charge, if it could have been preferred with equal justice against himself.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, it is certain that Barillon flattered himself on possessing a certain influence over Lord Halifax, and that the medium of this influence was no less a person than Algernon Sidney. We are already aware of the connection between Halifax and the Sidneys in consequence of his (first) marriage with Lady Dorothy Spencer, and we are also aware that the eldest son of that marriage had pursued his studies in Paris. Thither towards the end of 1676 had come from Nerac in Guienne<sup>2</sup> Colonel Algernon, an uncle of the lad's mother. With pathetic urgency<sup>3</sup> the lonely exile had caught at the society of his sister's grandson; and when about the same time the elder Henry Savile, on some errand unknown, had arrived in

<sup>1</sup> It seems best to quote Dalrymple at length: 'From Barillon's despatches of 20th and 27th October, 24th November, and 22nd December, 1678, it appears, that after Montague's offer to accuse Lord Danby, Barillon was continually busied in extending the party which was averse to Danby; . . . that Lord Halifax was privy to the intention of impeaching Lord Danby, in order to rise on his ruins, and Algernon Sidney was the person who managed the correspondence between him and Lord Halifax concerning it' (Dalrymple's *Memoirs*, ed. 1790, i. 253). Von Ranke also quotes the despatch of October 27 as explaining that Buckingham and Halifax saw in the prosecution of the Popish Plot a means of overturning the Ministry, or at least of severing the interests of Danby and York (v. 83).

<sup>2</sup> Where he had settled eleven years before, after his vain attempts to induce France or Holland to intervene for the establishment of a Republic in England.

<sup>3</sup> 'Wee waited,' says M. du Moulin, October 21, 1676 (*Devonshire MSS.*), 'off Coll. Sydney . . . who was extraordinary kynd to Mr Savile, and who approved much of the dissign to make the Tour of France . . . but he said when once he got Mr Savile at Nerac in Guyenne where he lives, and whither he intends to returne shortlie, he would keep him as long as he could before he would let him go to Montpellier.'

Paris, their common relationship to the young man seems to have formed a bond of union. An intimacy sprang up between our seventeenth-century courtier and the elderly Republican which ranks among the curiosities of friendship. It was through Savile's influence with Secretary Henry Coventry that Sidney a few months later received a formal permission to revisit England—which permission, as he informed his benefactor with passionate gratitude, he valued as he would have valued the saving of his life.<sup>1</sup> He had returned therefore from the Continent towards the close of 1677, and the outbreak of the Popish plot agitation seems to have first recalled his attention to political life.<sup>2</sup>

Over the relations which existed between Sidney and Lord Halifax there hangs a very disappointing obscurity. They had, indeed, something in common. Both were able men; both regarded politics from a philosophical as well as an empirical point of view; while it has been asserted, and we believe with truth, that Halifax was also, at heart, a Republican. So much at least is clear; Sidney at first conceived a strong admiration for the Viscount and courted his society.<sup>3</sup> Their paths, of course, soon diverged, for the contrast between them is even more profound than the resemblance. Algernon, a fine and early type of the purely Radical speculator, founded his political system on certain logical formulas which he considered equally applicable to all times and all countries. Lord Halifax, on the contrary, never swerved from the position which we have described in his own words on the title-page: 'Circumstances must come in, and are to be made a part of the matter of which we are to judge; positive decisions are always dangerous, more especially in Politicks.' As regards foreign policy again, the incompatibility soon becomes apparent. The importance attached by Halifax to international relations needs no further comment; while Sidney, like so many of his kind, showed an absolute indifference to this branch of the subject, which overpassed the bounds of decency. He cherished a Republican hatred

<sup>1</sup> Sidney to Savile, November 14 (1676; misdated 1682), December  $\frac{16}{28}$  (same year; the originals at Devonshire House do not give the year), Sidney's *Letters*, (1742), pp. 169, 175.

<sup>2</sup> He had certainly returned to England under an implied pledge of neutrality.

<sup>3</sup> For his admiration, see his earlier letters to Henry Savile. For his courtship of Halifax, see a letter from Dorothy Lady Sunderland, undated, but probably belonging to 1678, in the Spencer collection (Letter Book, box 31).



1678 for the House of Orange ; and this, together with a very natural kindliness for the land which had sheltered him, issued in a strange enthusiasm for Louis XIV., from whom, it is believed, he stooped to receive a pension.<sup>1</sup> At the moment of which we write he was certainly acting with Barillon in the Montague-Danby affair ;<sup>2</sup> and it was through him, as we have already intimated, that Barillon affected to control Lord Halifax. Such, we believe, is the real explanation of an insinuation which appears at first sight to reflect unfavourably upon the Viscount.

The attack on the Treasurer was postponed until Montague could obtain a seat in the Lower House ; and while the intrigue was actively though secretly pursued by the leading politicians of the Country party, a new and important member joined the confederacy.

III. The young Duke of Monmouth, favourite natural son of the King and Commander-in-Chief of the Army, had recently quarrelled with his uncle, the Duke of York ;<sup>3</sup> he harboured a personal grudge against the Treasurer ;<sup>4</sup> and as regards Scotch affairs, in which through his marriage with the heiress of Buccleuch he was personally interested, he had long coalesced with the professed allies of the English Opposition, the opponents of Secretary Lauderdale.<sup>5</sup>

At the moment of which we write additional motives existed for an approximation between himself and the English malcontents ; his connection with the standing forces was in itself a thing so invidious<sup>6</sup> as to suggest the propriety of conciliating public opinion. To the Country party, on the other hand, his adhesion was very acceptable. His great wealth, the influence that he possessed over his infatuated father, and a popularity which his charm of manner, the military reputation he had gained on the Continent, and the appearance of his name on the Black List of the Popish Imposture severally enhanced, rendered him a valuable ally. The correspondence

<sup>1</sup> See the evidence in Dalrymple.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> For this see Mackinnon's *Origin and Services of the Coldstream Guards*, pp. 153, 154 ; Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 85 ; *Stat. Pap. Dom.*, April 1678 (the cancelled commission).

<sup>4</sup> Who had attempted to supplant him at Court by a half-brother, the Earl of Plymouth, to whom Danby had recently married his daughter.

<sup>5</sup> Shaftesbury, out of animosity to Lauderdale, supported Monmouth. But it is, I think, clear that until 1678 Monmouth, despite his alliance with the Scotch malcontents under Hamilton (for which see *Lauderdale Papers*, iii. 103-4, 120), had no relations with the English Opposition.

<sup>6</sup> Grey's *Debates*, vi. 216-46.

was at first ostensibly secret;<sup>1</sup> but by the middle of 1678 November the young Duke refrained from voting on a proviso in favour of the Duke of York; and by the end of the session<sup>2</sup> Shaftesbury, Halifax, Essex, and the Duke of Monmouth were regarded as the chief enemies of Lord Danby. It is possible that the intimacy was rather favoured by Charles, who realised the advantages of a friend in the enemy's camp. In certain quarters, however, ulterior dangers were taking shape. Montague, conscious that York would never pardon his perfidy, began to lay weight upon rumours of his nephew's legitimacy<sup>3</sup> — rumours which had been current from his childhood,<sup>4</sup> but to which the unpopularity of the Duke of York gave a renewed impulse, and which the young Duke for the first time was suspected of countenancing.<sup>5</sup> Such pretensions, however, had not as yet passed the embryonic stage, and had assumed no political importance. Opposition to Danby was at once the real and the ostensible bond of the original alliance between the Duke of Monmouth and the Country party.<sup>6</sup>

The powerful coalition proceeded with caution, and it was not until Danby, upon warnings received, attempted to forestall Montague by effecting his arrest that the ex-diplomatist produced his papers.<sup>7</sup> Danby and his master were thus convicted of an offer "to betray the interests of Holland to the French King on secret payment of 900,000*l.* to the Privy Purse." The fury of the Houses may be imagined.<sup>10</sup> On December 23 Sir Henry Capel, at the bar of the House of Lords, impeached the Lord Treasurer in the name of the Commons of England. A motion for his withdrawal was negatived, whereupon Shaftesbury, Halifax, and sixteen others protested. On the 27th a motion to commit him until trial was also negatived; and

<sup>1</sup> Clarke's *Life of James*, i. 526, 530; Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 578.

<sup>2</sup> Temple's *Works* (1770), ii. 477.

<sup>3</sup> *Life of James*, i. 531; Dalrymple, i. 312, January 1679.

<sup>4</sup> Pepys, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> York to Orange, December 9, 1678 (*Life*, i. 530; Dalrymple, i. 259).

The abortive and spasmodic suggestions of Buckingham in 1667 and Ashley in 1674 were almost certainly unknown to the Duke of Monmouth.

<sup>6</sup> See Cavendish in Grey's *Debates*, vi. 225, 347.

<sup>7</sup> December 19.

<sup>8</sup> During the preceding spring.

<sup>9</sup> The documents specially stipulated that the affair was to be concealed from Secretary Coventry. The discreditable manner in which Danby, towards the close of his life, garbled these documents for publication has been recently demonstrated by Mr. Eliot Hodgkin and Mr. J. C. Jeaffreson. *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xv., part 2, pp. 185, 198.

<sup>10</sup> Danby attempted to turn the tables on Russell, but W. Coventry and

1678 the same two Lords with thirteen others signed a second protest.<sup>1</sup> At this juncture Charles, alarmed for the safety of his Minister, prorogued (December 30). Three weeks more and a proclamation issued for the long-desired dissolution, by which step Danby hoped to conciliate his adversaries. The state of the finances,<sup>2</sup> moreover, necessitated an immediate session, and writs were despatched for a new Parliament with the least possible delay.

the party in general rose in his defence as one man. The 'dealings' from which Russell defends himself are, of course, pecuniary.

<sup>1</sup> They were wrong; the charge upon which he was impeached was, as a misdemeanour, really bailable (Hallam, ed. 1850, ii. 108).

<sup>2</sup> France had refused pecuniary assistance, and Parliamentary supply had failed in consequence of a difference between the Houses. The Commons wished to place it in the hands of the Chamber of London, in lieu of the Exchequer; and Halifax twice protested against the action of the Lords in rejecting this proviso. He also ranked among the five managers of an abortive conference (*Lords' Journal*, December 23, 26).

## CHAPTER VI

## THE PRIVY COUNCIL OF 1679

THE elections constituted, of course, the immediate topic of interest; and as no General Election had taken place for eighteen years, the excitement was proportionally intense. Lord Halifax remained in town,<sup>1</sup> while the letters of Sir William Hickman<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Thynne<sup>3</sup> kept him acquainted with the fortunes of war in Nottingham and the Midlands. Sir William Coventry, much to his own disgust, found himself re-elected.<sup>4</sup> But even these absorbing considerations cannot have diverted the attention of Halifax from an event which proved in the sequel of great importance both to himself and to the nation. Early in February his brother-in-law Sunderland, a diplomatist of some years' standing, was appointed Secretary of State.<sup>5</sup> Far-reaching in its consequences, the appointment had at the moment little political signification,<sup>6</sup> as Lord Sunderland's duties had hitherto kept him at a distance from the Parliamentary arena. The first result of the change had a special interest for Lord Halifax, since to Sunderland<sup>7</sup> we

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches*, January  $\frac{7}{17}$ , 1678, give a curious rumour of designs for the assassination of Shaftesbury, Essex, and Halifax, as opposed to the Court. Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Re-elected member for Retford (*Spencer MSS.* 31 (36)).

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (51).

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Thynne (to Lord Halifax, February 26) expects 'our friend' will argue that, being no freeman, he cannot be compelled to serve. 'But y' will faile him as his last devise did for ye house will not bee prevailed with to part with him; the Elections in ye countries are generally good, but consist rather of new faces, soe y' I am confident there will not bee 180 of ye old Stocke.'

<sup>5</sup> See Dalrymple, i. 288-91. He took the oaths February 9.

<sup>6</sup> He had obtained the suffrages of the Duchess of Portsmouth of the French Ambassador by servile professions (Dalrymple, i. 290-92).

<sup>7</sup> Letter in *Spencer MSS.* 31 (41), unsigned and unaddressed, but evidently from Sunderland to Savile, written in October 1678. Savile was at the moment in France (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii. part 5, p. 52, July 14, 1678) on a secret mission the details of which have not transpired (*Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 22; *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 67-76), and which had followed on one of his periodic disgraces, to which however rumour, contrary to wont, assigned some political origin (*Grey's Debates*, v. 381, 384, May 1678; Dapby's *Letters*, p. 78).

1679 may doubtless attribute the appointment of *Henry Savile* as his successor at Versailles, with the title of Envoy.<sup>1</sup> To this arrangement the country was indebted for a capable and conscientious representative; patriotism, as Henry Savile himself characteristically remarks, is apt to steal upon your diplomatist, however foppish, 'in spite of his teeth.'<sup>2</sup> Nor can the historian fail to congratulate himself upon an event to which he owes so many valuable letters of Algernon Sydney and the most important part of the 'Savile Correspondence.'

But the result of the polls soon monopolised attention. As the returns were analysed, it became evident that the Country party commanded a much-increased majority. At a pinch the Court had been hitherto able to dispose of one hundred and fifty votes; thirty was the utmost on which it could now rely,<sup>3</sup> and Halifax naturally ranked with the most influential among the leaders of the Opposition.<sup>4</sup>

Danby redoubled his attempts at conciliation; the disbanding advanced; the Duke of York, whose influence the country so strongly dreaded, was ostentatiously despatched to Brussels; and on the eve of the session<sup>5</sup> it became known that Danby would retire from the Treasury in a fortnight's time<sup>6</sup> *with the title of Marquis*. This unlucky rider entirely nullified the propitiatory effect of the promised resignation. A storm of resentment arose, exasperated by a privilege quarrel, in which the interests of Danby were supposed to be concerned, and which delayed for nearly a fortnight the formalities attendant on the opening of Parliament. Scarcely had these attained completion, and scarcely had the Commons, upon the presentation of their Speaker, left the House of Lords, ere Lord Shaftesbury attacked the obnoxious patent, and moved for an Address on the subject. Charles had left the throne, and stood, after his fashion, technically unrecognised, by the fire, as Lord Halifax rose in his place.

<sup>1</sup> Narcissus Luttrell, i. 7, January 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 91. We give the obvious construction of the passage; but it is possible that 'foppish,' which seems to be used by Henry Savile elsewhere as an equivalent for 'priggish' (*Correspondence*, p. 113), refers to the sentiment he is enunciating. Henry's credentials are in the Bodleian with his instructions.

<sup>3</sup> Von Ranke, v. 94.

<sup>4</sup> Penn, writing to Algernon Sidney, who had been defeated in his candidature at Guildford by actual fraud on the part of the courtiers, offers to consult on the question Buckingham, Shaftesbury, Essex, Halifax, Holles, and Grey (Dixon's *Penn*, pp. 207-8).

<sup>5</sup> Parliament met on March 6.

\ <sup>6</sup> I.e. with Lady Day.

Fixing his eyes upon the august spectator, he ironically 1679  
refuted the motion. Lord Shaftesbury, he exclaimed,  
must be the victim of a 'flamm' report; it was impossible  
to imagine that the King could ever be prevailed upon to  
do an act so ungrateful to his people; but if such advance-  
ment should indeed prove to be the recompense of treason,  
the thing was 'not to be borne.' 'My God!' cried Charles  
bitterly, 'how am I abused! And I must bear it and say  
nothing!'<sup>1</sup>

All hope of a compromise between Danby and the  
Opposition had now been shattered. Parliament turned  
indeed, for the moment, full cry upon the investigation  
of the 'Popish Plot.' Lord Halifax played his part in  
the inquiry,<sup>2</sup> and, together with Lord Shaftesbury, showed  
himself 'eminent in pleading for indulgence to tender-  
conscienced Protestants, and severity against Papists.'<sup>3</sup>  
But on March 20 the proceedings against Danby were  
resumed; and the keen interest displayed by Lord Halifax  
in the matter and in the reconstitution of the Treasury  
is shown by the following letter to his brother, the earliest  
which has been recovered:--

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.*

March <sup>20<sup>th</sup></sup><sub>30</sub>, 78 9.<sup>1</sup>

I make use of this minute to write by this gentleman who  
is just now going towards you. It will be no news to you by  
that time this reaches you that my L<sup>d</sup> Treasurer hath resolved  
to lay down his staff; and it will be as little to tell you that the  
world is still jealous he may take it up again in convenient  
time, or else keep such a station near the King as may make  
him the same omnipotent figure as before under the disguise  
of some other name. This, you may imagine, the hard-hearted  
Commons of England will be very willing to prevent, and  
therefore in all probability they will go on with their im-  
peachment now that all the dispute about the Speaker is  
made up by the late short prorogation for two days. The  
Commissioners of the Treasury design'd are L<sup>d</sup> Arlington,  
S<sup>r</sup> John Ernely, S<sup>r</sup> Edward Deering, Lory Hyde, and Sidney

<sup>1</sup> Von Ranke, v. 100 (from the despatches of the Venetian, Sarotti), and  
*Hutton Correspondence*, i. 184.

<sup>2</sup> He was a member of the Committee for Examinations, and reported  
once or twice.

<sup>3</sup> Algernon Sidney to Henry Savile, April 28, p. 42. Can this refer to the  
tyrannical Bill for clearing London of Papists, on the Committee of which  
he sat? He offered a paper of additional clauses, nature not specified  
(*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, pp. 105-108). The Bill fortunately  
dropped with the prorogation.

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxii., p. 76 ('new style' added by Mr.  
Cooper).

1679 Godolphin. I am call'd upon in haste, and therefore can add no more. Adieu. Yours.

My old Lady Sunderland hath been very ill, and is not yet out of danger.

The board enumerated by Lord Halifax was eventually constituted, with one, and that a significant, alteration - the portent of a remarkable Ministerial revolution. From the Court point of view the crisis appeared ominous to a degree. The Opposition seemed practically master of the situation, and, goaded as it was by fear and suspicion, its future action afforded a gloomy field for speculation. The withdrawal of the Treasurer, if calculated to relieve the Government, also threatened it with collapse. His monopoly of power<sup>1</sup> had resulted in an Administration (himself excepted) of political ciphers. Among the advisers of Charles, three only, each of them new to the position, possessed both influence with the King and credit in the country; and all of these were convinced that a treaty with the Opposition offered the one hope of averting actual catastrophe.

I. Such was certainly the opinion of the young Duke of Monmouth, whose influence at Court had been largely enhanced by the eclipse of Danby and the Duke of York, and of whose popularity Charles (having as he thought averted, by a formal declaration<sup>2</sup> of the young man's illegitimacy, the possibility of a disputed succession) was anxious to reap the advantage. Reresby describes him as 'the man in power.'

II. Lord Sunderland again, on acceding to office, feared to inherit the odium of the fallen Minister. The sense of personal expediency, which alone governed his political career, taught him to avoid the affectation of omnipotence which had been the Treasurer's ruin, and to court the Country party as the predominant factor in the situation. The domestic ties which connected him with Lords Shaftesbury and Halifax, and the fact that Sunderland as a new man was hampered by no pledges, and had incurred no responsibility, facilitated the process.

III. Three days before the meeting of Parliament the well-known diplomatist Sir William Temple, whose early friendship with Sir George Savile we have noted, had returned from a diplomatic mission. Under a high sense

<sup>1</sup> Admitted by his own follower Reresby.

<sup>2</sup> In January. The denial was formally repeated in Council two days before the Duke of York's departure, of which indeed it was a condition.

of his sagacity, and of the credit which he enjoyed among 1679 politicians of the Country party, Charles implored him to accept office; but the wary diplomatist, fully conscious of the perils of the conjuncture, contrived to evade compliance.

Standing as he did, by virtue of his temperament and purely diplomatic experience, aloof from faction, Temple gauged the weakness of the Administration and appreciated thoroughly the character of that hatred which (involving more or less the Government itself) centred upon the person of Danby. It was, he perceived, a mixture of distrust and of the jealousy which monopoly of power always excites. The distrust, he believed, might be obviated by transferring the management of affairs to a popular and representative council; the jealousy by giving all the leading men, with the exception of Shaftesbury, whom he regarded with inveterate suspicion, seats upon the board. Nor, so he flattered himself, could such a distribution of power fail to reduce the exorbitant influence of the Duke of Monmouth, which he beheld with some misgivings.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile he appears to have had no conception that a scheme analogous to his own had arisen in the minds of the Duke of Monmouth and of Lord Sunderland, who soon entered into a mutual confidence. The first step towards the realisation of these projects was certainly taken by the two latter, who foresaw that the constitution of the Commission by which the Treasurer was to be superseded must attract much attention.<sup>2</sup> They were anxious to eliminate the still unpopular Arlington, and they opened negotiations with Lord Essex, who, for reasons which do him credit, had been recalled from Ireland. His financial qualifications were well known, and, though an avowed recruit of the Country party, he was not unacceptable to the King. Eventually he took his seat on the board,<sup>3</sup> and the *Commons* on the motion of William Coventry hastened to intimate their confidence in the new First Lord.<sup>4</sup> The Country *Peers*, on the other hand, resented, if report may be credited, the apparent desertion of their ally, and it

<sup>1</sup> Such, we maintain, is the simple explanation of a project from which Ranke and Macaulay have deduced subtle constitutional designs.

<sup>2</sup> The new Commissioners were regarded as men of honour, but a more popular and a more experienced board had been hoped for (*Secret Dutch Despatches*, March 1<sup>st</sup>, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888., f. 240).

<sup>3</sup> March 26. (See Lady Sunderland to Evelyn, March 28; Blencowe's *Sidney*, vol. i. Intro. p. lxxi.)

<sup>4</sup> By assigning the disbanding supply to the Exchequer, instead of to the Chamber of London. Essex succeeded to no enviable task. He found in the Treasury, besides appropriated moneys, the sum of 17. 2s. 10d.



1679 was even affirmed that he thus violated an understanding between himself, Halifax, and Shaftesbury, by which the three had engaged to accept office in common or not at all.<sup>1</sup> We fancy, however, that these jealousies were early disarmed by hints of a more extended Ministerial revolution impending in the near future. As early as March 28 rumour spoke of negotiations between the Court and the heads of the Opposition.<sup>2</sup> Before April 1 Lord Cavendish, one of the most obnoxious among the Country leaders, had been admitted to an audience, and Shaftesbury himself, by royal permission, had dined with Sunderland at Whitehall.<sup>3</sup> With whom these overtures originated we cannot precisely assert. Temple, as is well known, assumed the entire credit to himself.<sup>4</sup> Personally, however, we believe that far more influence must be assigned to the counsels of Sunderland and of the Duke of Monmouth, and that Charles merely flattered the vanity of Temple, which was considerable, by an affectation of peculiar confidence.<sup>5</sup>

The rumours of a political approximation spread with great rapidity. On April 1<sup>7</sup>, Algernon Sydney, whose gratitude towards Henry Savile took the acceptable form of regular news-letters, peculiarly welcome from the scantiness of more official reports,<sup>6</sup> mentions Halifax and Essex as possible candidates for the Irish Viceroyalty. 'I wonder,' writes Henry Savile himself to his brother, April 1<sup>5</sup>, 'you could afford me any one line in a time so full of notable accidents, in which I doubt not you have had your share; and I hope in a little time now to hear that you are admitted to court as well as my L<sup>d</sup> Cavendish.'<sup>7</sup> It appears, however, that Charles at this moment reserved for Halifax, among the Opposition leaders, his special detestation—a distinction possibly due to recent and ranking sarcasm.<sup>8</sup> 'I . . .,' says Temple, 'proposed

<sup>1</sup> Temple.

<sup>2</sup> Barillon (March 29<sup>th</sup> April 7<sup>th</sup>) reports negotiations between the King, Shaftesbury, Halifax, and other chiefs of the Cabals (Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 321).

<sup>3</sup> *Dutch Despatch (Open)* of April 1<sup>st</sup> (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, ff. 87, 88).

<sup>4</sup> He apparently refers these negotiations to the middle of April.

<sup>5</sup> Public opinion certainly ascribed the change to Monmouth and the two Ministers. (See Reresby's *Memoirs*, ed. 1875, p. 167; James II. [in Dalrymple, i. 296]; Algernon Sidney to Savile [*Letters*, April 21, p. 3]; and Burnet. Barillon [Dalrymple, i. 292; and Christie, ii. p. cx] holds a similar opinion.)

<sup>6</sup> See Savile's bitter comments on the subject (*Savile Correspondence*).

<sup>7</sup> 'Whose personal behaviour to his Maj<sup>ty</sup> I thought had been such as would not have brought him to Whitehall before you' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 78). For Cavendish, see Grey's *Debates*, vii. 189, 191, 192.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 141.

<sup>9</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 495 (*Works*, edit. 1770, vol. ii.).

Lord Halifax as one of the Lords, whom the king . . . 1679 indeed kicked at, in our first consultation, more than any of the rest.' Lord Halifax seems to have realised — probably through Monmouth, Sunderland, or Essex — the extent of the Royal displeasure, which, however, he refused to deprecate.

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*

April <sup>10th</sup>/<sub>20th</sub>, '79.

I had yours <sup>2</sup> last night, and deliver'd both the enclosed to my L<sup>d</sup> of Essex, who telleth me that the business is already done which my Lady Savile <sup>3</sup> recommendeth to him. I find you suppose me amongst others by this time restored to grace at Court, but I am so ill at making steps as they call it, and the good impressions that have been made of me do so remain that you may reckon me amongst the incurable, except there be a miracle made on purpose for me, and that you will say is not very likely. Your late friend <sup>4</sup> taketh up all our time and is almost as great a grievance to us now he is falling as he was whilst he remain'd in power. Our house is gentle, but the House of Commons, being a true representative of England, are stiff and surly in the point, not to be soften'd by conferences, nor persuaded by expedients, though we are to make one tryal more to see whether they will relent.<sup>5</sup> I hope you have made a good change, as well as the nation, by having the treasurer turned into a commission where you have friends

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxx., p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> Of April 7, already quoted.

<sup>3</sup> Of Copley. (See *ibid.* p. 78.)

<sup>4</sup> Lord Danby. It is probable that Henry Savile, in consequence of events in the spring of 1678 (Grey's *Debates*, v. 381, 384; Danby's *Letters*, p. 78), regarded the fall of his former patron with equanimity. In the letter to which this is an answer he says that the Treasurer had tottered so long as to give his friends time to prepare, and that, in consequence of his caprice, few but his own family will lament him save from a sense of honour.

<sup>5</sup> Danby had determined to plead the King's pardon in bar of impeachment (March 22). The Lords had decided to recognise its validity, and to fall back upon a Bill of banishment and disqualification, debarring him from office, gift, or pension, and excluding him from Parliament. Halifax had been a member of the small Committee appointed to frame the Bill, and assisted in a conference on the subject with the Lower House, which had insisted on an impeachment (March 24). At this juncture Danby had absconded; the Commons had retorted with a Bill of attainder (April 1). The House of Lords, at the instance of Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Essex, had softened this into a Bill of banishment agreeable to its former resolution (*Lords' Journal*, April 4; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, p. 111; Algernon Sidney to H. Savile, April 7, *Letters*, p. 21), and each House maintained with equal obstinacy its favourite nostrum. The conference which Halifax anticipated proved fruitless. On the 14th the Lords consented to the attainder in the event of Danby's not surrendering before the 21st; and Monmouth, Halifax, Bridgewater, and Grey of Wark (all of the Country party), with the Lord Privy Seal (Anglesey, an old Presbyterian), were ordered to submit the Bill for the Royal Assent. On the following day Danby surrendered.

1679 that at least will be just to you; but if they go no further I doubt that will hardly serve your turn, especially if you go the journey<sup>1</sup> with an equipage suitable to your excellency's character.<sup>2</sup> The Prince of Condé was long since thought a better brother than ordinary to his sister Longueville,<sup>3</sup> so it is no surprise to hear he continueth it. It is a misfortune to great people that they must be tempted to think death a worse thing than it is, by the weight their friends put upon it, either out of kindness or ostentation; and, as their physicians must not let them dye without pain, so their friends will not let them leave the world without making them be troubled at it: well fare the skillfull poisoners<sup>4</sup> you speak of that make an easy and a short passage into the other world, and yet the world is so ungratefull as that they must be punish'd for it. My young men are well at Geneva,<sup>5</sup> where I hope the King of France will let them alone, and not force such a couple of hopefull Protestants to take sanctuary for their religion in Switzerland. Harry<sup>6</sup> is making haste towards you, but I am apt to believe you may be gone from Paris before he cometh to it. However I have allow'd him only to stay there for a few days, being desirous now to have him with me. I write this in the committee chamber, and am just now going into the house, which sits this afternoon. Adieu.

The objections which Charles had entertained against the admission of Lord Halifax to power were at last, as it seemed, overcome. 'Upon several representations,' says Temple, 'of his family, his abilities, his estate<sup>7</sup> and credit, as well as talent to ridicule and unravel whatever he was spited at, I thought his majesty had been contented with it.' Scarcely, however, had the proposed reconciliation taken a definite shape in the schemes of the Court, ere the repugnance of Charles for Lord Halifax reappeared with singular persistence. 'He raised,' says Temple, 'new difficulties<sup>8</sup> upon it; and appeared a great while invincible in them, though we all joined in the defence of it: and at last, I told the king, we would fall upon our knees to gain a point that we all thought necessary for his service.' The Duke of Monmouth in private seconded these exhortations,<sup>9</sup> and the King eventually

<sup>1</sup> Some royal progress, which was, however, postponed (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 77, 79, 82, 83).

<sup>2</sup> Official dignity.

<sup>4</sup> Said to be dying.

<sup>5</sup> The great poison scandals of Le Voisin, &c., then in progress.

<sup>6</sup> His younger sons, who were studying at the university there.

<sup>7</sup> His eldest son, who on quitting Paris had travelled in Italy and Spain.

<sup>8</sup> Henry Sidney computed that Essex, Sunderland, and Halifax together had more land than the King (*Diary*, July 17, i. 29).

<sup>9</sup> Burnet, on Sunderland's authority, confirms this, ii. 203 (ed. 1833).

<sup>2</sup> Burnet was told by the Duke that he had as great a difficulty in over-

yielded to solicitation. But the precedent was developed, 1679 to the infinite mortification of Temple. Instigated no doubt by Monmouth, Sunderland, and Essex, Charles replaced upon the list the name of Lord Shaftesbury, and moreover revived in his favour the presidency of the Council.

The new arrangement was officially promulgated April 21, and announced in Parliament on the following day<sup>1</sup>—the Council as reconstituted numbering thirty-three members, of which the Country party, if united, could command a decided majority.<sup>2</sup> The entire transaction, however, excited little enthusiasm; ulterior designs were suspected, especially by those eminent leaders who found themselves forgotten. For the most striking omission—that of William Coventry<sup>3</sup>—the Knight himself is probably responsible.

Lord Halifax, on the other hand, assumed from the first that leading position in the new Council to which he was entitled by his talents and high Parliamentary status. Algernon Sidney, who hailed the new era with no little satisfaction, immediately prophesied that Halifax, Sunderland, and Essex would, if united, control the policy of the Administration.<sup>4</sup> In the House of Lords it is acknowledged his influence was scarcely, if at all, inferior to that of Lord Shaftesbury, while no man had a better interest in the House of Commons; and his reputation for political consistency, unlike that of his uncle, remained unblemished.<sup>5</sup> The report that he was a candidate for the

coming the King's prejudice 'as ever in anything that he studied to bring the king to.'

<sup>1</sup> The account of this 'note worthy' revolution, in the *Dutch Despatches*, is curious. The idea is erroneously ascribed to Holles, and the actual arrangements to Shaftesbury, Monmouth, and the Duchess of Portsmouth. The retention of Lauderdale and some of Danby's creatures was unpopular (*Secret Despatch* of May 5, 1679 [x.s.], Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888, f. 217b).

<sup>2</sup> Of 'Country' Peers it contained the Duke of Cumberland (Prince Rupert), Monmouth, Shaftesbury, Halifax, Winchester, Salisbury, Fauconberg, Bridgewater, and Holles; of the 'Country' party in the Commons, Lords Russell and Cavendish, Capel, the brother of Essex, and Mr. Powle. Lord Anglesey (Privy Seal), Lord Roberts, and the Bishop of London probably sympathised with that party—as, of course, did Temple and Sunderland. The bias of Sir Edward Seymour and of Newcastle, brother-in-law of Halifax, cannot be certainly defined. Besides these, there were some dozen courtiers and old officials, among whom we may mention Henry Coventry and Sir Thomas Chichele. The entire list may be seen in Temple.

<sup>3</sup> Algernon Sidney makes the mysterious comment that there was 'as yet' no occasion for his admission (*Letters*, p. 35).

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, pp. 34, 61, April 21, May 12.

<sup>5</sup> Reresby, p. 168.

<sup>6</sup> Henry Sidney observes, July 17, that Essex and Halifax 'are of that

1679) Viceroyalty of Ireland revived, though he 'took' occasion to declare to sir W. Coventry, that he never thought of it, nor would he take it, if it were offered him,' since under the government of the Duke of Ormond that country 'was in very good hands (he thought), for the king's service, and wished it might so continue.'<sup>1</sup> Another rumour affirmed that he had been offered the Secretaryship in succession to Henry Coventry,<sup>2</sup> whose ill health rendered his retirement personally imperative; and it is certain that during the course of the summer Lord Halifax refused both appointments.<sup>3</sup>

Within a week of the change meanwhile he ranked among the members of the 'Committee for Foreign Affairs'--or inner Ministerial circle-- which, despite the promise of Charles to avoid cabals and secret councils, became immediately inevitable from an administrative point of view. Lords Sunderland and Essex, Sir William Temple, the Duke of Monmouth, and Lord Shaftesbury 'were all included in this Committee, besides two or three officials who, though departmentally important, had sunk, politically speaking, to the position of ciphers.'<sup>3</sup>

We have already seen reason to believe that during their five years of common opposition the union of Halifax and Shaftesbury had never been either close or entirely cordial. It seemed probable that any latent

reputation, that nobody can blame them for any one action in their whole lives' (*Diary*, edit. Blencowe, i. 29).

<sup>1</sup> Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 576; Algernon Sidney, April 21, p. 35; Henry Savile, May 17 (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 86).

<sup>2</sup> Algernon Sidney (*Letters*, April 21, p. 35).

<sup>3</sup> The Viceroyalty might well appear an office of ill omen to the nephew of Strafford. So Henry Savile, May 17: 'I wish you,' he adds, 'better fortune than our great-uncle' (Strafford) 'found there; though I think you go in a time when you will run as great hazards as any of your predecessors, and for that reason the gluing outside of that preferment does not please me so much as if I had heard you had a less honourable, provided a less hazardous, station' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 86). In the seventeenth century the Viceroyalty of Ireland, which was worth 30,000*l.* a year, held much the same place in public estimation as the Viceroyalty of India does now. It was the greatest place in the gift of the Crown, but involved temporary exile and absence from the political arena at home.

<sup>1</sup> Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 328, from Baillon. In the British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, f. 1, there are some notes concerning the 'Committee of Intelligence,' another name for the interior Committee (see *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 91, 92); Lord Roberts and Prince Rupert are there added to the list. In the *Dutch Despatches (Open)* (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 111b), <sup>April 25</sup> <sup>May</sup>, four days after the change, the Committee is said to consist of men all of whom are at present acknowledged to possess sound views in what concerns the common interests of England and the States.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Coventry, the Chancellor, Lord Arlington.

antipathy should develop now that both were readmitted 1679 into councils of State on terms of practical equality. In point of fact the new Committee was not many days old ere it was divided into practically hostile camps—the one phalanx being directed by Lord Shaftesbury; while a ‘Triumvirate,’ composed of Halifax, Sunderland, and Essex, headed the other, which was reinforced, after his usual wary fashion, by the prudent Temple. The origin of these factions is variously given.

I. Temple, whose inherent reliability is somewhat impaired by personal vanity and a very unfounded belief in the veracity of Lord Sunderland, ascribes the entire rupture to his own distrust of Lord Shaftesbury. Sunderland he designates as his original confidant, and he insinuates that Lord Essex joined the coalition solely by Lord Sunderland’s desire. ‘My lord Halifax,’ adds the diplomatist, ‘appearing unsatisfied by observing where the king’s confidence was; I proposed . . . to receive him into all our consultations; which I thought would both enter him into credit with the king, and give us more ease in the course of his affairs.’ Neither Essex nor Sunderland, so Temple maintains, received the suggestion with much alacrity,<sup>1</sup> and Sunderland (though ostensibly on the best terms with his brother-in-law<sup>2</sup>) specially remonstrated, asserting, says Sir William, that ‘I should not find lord Halifax the person I took him for, but one that would draw with no-body, and still climbing to the top himself.’ Nevertheless, so Temple informs us, his Lordship was admitted; and the connection continued some weeks, “with so much union, and so disinterested endeavours for the general good of his majesty’s service and the Kingdom’s, that I,” says Temple, ‘could not but say to them, at the end of one of our meetings, that we four were either the four honestest men in England, or the greatest Knaves; for we made one another at least believe that we were the honestest men in the world.’

II. But, despite these positive assertions, we are inclined to believe that the actual split was from the first inevitable, and that it took place immediately and upon a substantial issue. On April 28, five days after the institution of the Council, Lord Russell, one of the new admissions (with whom Shaftesbury was peculiarly intimate), brought up to the House of Lords a vote of the Lower House. This

<sup>1</sup> ‘Lord Essex received this overture with his usual dryness; Lord Sunderland opposed it a good deal’ (Temple’s *Works* [1770], ii. 499, 500).

<sup>2</sup> See the ensuing letter of Lord Halifax.

1679 expressly defined the prospect of a *Popish successor* as a main peril of the political situation; and the debate which had preceded had clearly evinced<sup>1</sup> that the solution favoured by Lord Shaftesbury involved the *exclusion* of the Duke of York from the order of succession.<sup>2</sup>

This project, to the general surprise, evoked from the first the determined antagonism of Lord Halifax. So uncompromising was his language that several among his friends,<sup>3</sup> foreboding the differences which ensued, 'took great pains on him, to divert him from opposing it so furiously as he did.'<sup>4</sup> Their efforts, however, were vain; and round Halifax, as round a centre, opposition to the new project crystallised. The official element of course coalesced, while the conservative traditions of a successful diplomatic career reinforced the hereditary loyalty of Temple. Lord Sunderland adhered to the party which appeared the strongest, and the action of Lord Essex was determined by constitutional scruples<sup>5</sup> which the exclusionists eventually overcame. It is needless to state which party had the Royal countenance; and two days after the ominous vote in the Commons, Charles II. accentuated the situation by a speech to the Houses in which he forestalled the exclusionist faction. His proposal ran as follows: that on the demise of the Crown all preferment, ecclesiastical and secular, should be vested in the control of Parliament during the lifetime of any Papist successor; arrangements being made for an automatic assembling of Parliament. In this definite and liberal proposition we recognise the policy of the 'Triumvirate.'

We must now pause to inquire, as his contemporaries were eagerly inquiring, what reasons had moved Lord Halifax to declare in so striking and, as it seems, so unexpected a manner against the policy of exclusion. The animosity which existed between himself and the Duke of York was notorious; nor did Halifax affect to conceal his contempt for the school which invested the institution of hereditary monarchy with supernatural sanctions. At this moment he warned Temple<sup>6</sup> against laying undue weight, in his political speculations, upon the principle of

<sup>1</sup> By the speech of Bennett, confidential secretary of Lord Shaftesbury. He had further referred to the possibility of discovering means 'by which the King may have a son.' (See Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 330 and note.)

<sup>2</sup> The position of Russell is not perfectly clear. We imagine that his passion for the exclusion project developed later on.

<sup>3</sup> Burnet and Tillotson.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet, ii. 212.

<sup>5</sup> Burnet, ii. 210.

<sup>6</sup> Who had just published some political essays of which Halifax in general approved (Temple's *Memoirs*, p. 506 [Works, edit. 1770, vol. ii.]).

paternal dominion <sup>1</sup> 'for fear of destroying the rights of the people;' while his own utterances had long earned for him the reputation of Republican sympathies. 'Lord Halifax's arguing now so much against the danger of turning the monarchy to be elective, was,' says Burnet, 'the more extraordinary in him, because he had made an hereditary monarchy the subject of his mirth; and had often said, Who takes a coachman to drive him, because his father was a good coachman? Yet he was now jealous of a small slip in the succession.'<sup>2</sup>

As a matter of fact, it appears certain that Halifax actually entertained, and in moments of speculative intercourse freely expressed, a theoretic preference for the aristocratic—or, rather, oligarchic—form of Commonwealth which had succeeded so well in the United Provinces.<sup>3</sup> It is also possible that in arguing the question with Algernon Sidney or other Republican friends he pointed out how nearly the restrictions of the monarchical authority which he proposed to substitute for an exclusion would approximate our Government to the Republican model. It is clear that this aspect of the question appealed <sup>4</sup> to certain among the Republicans, and excited in the breasts of the Prince of Orange and the more Conservative exclusionists, such as Russell,<sup>5</sup> a corresponding repugnance. But we are unable to accept Burnet's contention <sup>6</sup> that arguments of this kind determined the action of Halifax himself. Such a policy he expressly repudiated some eighteen months later in answer to the objections of the Prince of Orange,<sup>7</sup> and it is moreover indisputable that he regarded the Republican form of government, however ideally desirable, as alien to the existing temper of the English people.

The real motives of Halifax must remain a matter for

<sup>1</sup> The passage here criticised is evidently one which occurs in the 'Essay upon the Origin and Nature of Government' (*Works of Temple*, edit. 1770, i. 39-46). From the doctrine of paternal dominion Filmer had deduced the divine origin of monarchy.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, ii. 205. Oldmixon's paraphrase of this sentence is very interesting (ii. 631): Of '[a Commonwealth] as appears by his Writings he thought as favourably as he could do, who expected still more honours from the Court.'

<sup>3</sup> See the *Rough Draught and Character of a Trimmer*.

<sup>4</sup> Macpherson.

<sup>5</sup> See his dying speech. Lord Shaftesbury's use of the same argument (Burnet, ii. 205) must be regarded as an artifice of debate.

<sup>6</sup> The more so as the limitations were only to become operative under a Popish successor.

<sup>7</sup> See Halifax, conversation with Dutch Ambassador, December 1680, given in a subsequent chapter.

See the *Rough Draught*.



1679 conjecture. But it is clear that Lord Halifax viewed with extreme alarm an alliance which was rapidly forming between Lord Shaftesbury and the Duke of Monmouth. He believed that in advocating the policy of exclusion Shaftesbury really intended to enact the part of a king-maker, and to substitute for the Duke of York his own nominee. The charge is in the main correct. It cannot be brought indeed with justice against the exclusionists as a body; nor was Shaftesbury in any way bound to the interests of the Duke of Monmouth. But the ex-Chancellor certainly maintained that the elevation of the young Duke was the expedient which eventually would excite the greatest enthusiasm among the masses and do most to reconcile the King towards the exclusion of his brother. To this policy, on the other hand, Lord Halifax was diametrically opposed, both from keen aristocratic feeling<sup>1</sup> and from purely political motives. Strong in his sense of the issues which the European crisis involved, he looked forward with a very real expectation to the day when William of Orange, the head of the anti-Gallican party on the Continent, should succeed, in right of his marriage with the Heiress-Presumptive, to a paramount influence over the counsels of England.

In the second place, there is no doubt that Halifax laid considerable stress on the danger of a renewed civil war, which, as he believed, must inevitably result from a disputed succession.

In the third place, we seem to discern, throughout his whole career, a strong objection to *ex post facto* interference with individual rights. He had already, as we remember, vindicated the hereditary legislative privileges of the Popish Peers; and without attaching to the claims of the Stuart family an abnormal and fictitious sanctity, he may well have believed that to abrogate in so arbitrary a fashion the birthright of its principal member was to strike a blow at the sacredness of property and the established laws of descent.<sup>2</sup> Yet on the other hand, by supporting the 'Test Act,' which denied to Papists the opportunity of an official career, he had practically asserted for the nation a right to restrict

<sup>1</sup> Which would have regarded the elevation of a bastard as an insult to the nation.

<sup>2</sup> See a curious passage in Temple's *Works* (edition 1770, ii. 211) for some interesting reflections on the transformation of the elective monarchy in Denmark into an hereditary one. 'The change, he says, was not unpopular, 'because nothing seemed to concern property.' He appears to imply that this objection would have lain against the converse alteration.

the *exercise of executive functions*. The argument there- 1679  
fore which confirmed to James the *title* of King and the  
possession of the *hereditary revenues* could not hinder  
the State from limiting the *political powers* of a dangerous  
successor.<sup>1</sup>

Matters had reached this stage when Lord Halifax  
received the congratulations of his brother Henry,<sup>2</sup> with the  
kindly regrets of the warm-hearted uncle for the shortness  
of the period during which his eldest nephew proposed  
to remain in Paris. 'But,' so he concludes his playful  
reproaches, 'his Ma<sup>ty</sup> having trusted his business with a  
man, has not this long time been an argument for you to  
trust anything else with him, especially your son and heir.'

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

May Day, 10th.

It seemeth you had the knowledge of my preferment before  
I could tell it you, so little did I apprehend myself to be likely  
to be readmitted into the state of grace, as you might perceive  
by the stile of my last, in w<sup>ch</sup> I assure you I did not dissemble  
with you. To undertake the being useful to my friends in the  
station I am in, would be a piece of arrogance very unfitt for a  
councellour of a new edition; but if ever such a miracle should  
come to pass, as that from such a degree of disfavour as I have  
lain under I should come to have any credit, no doubt but our  
envoyé in France might rely upon a friend at court. I am  
already brib'd to it, by your zeal to justify me against such  
scandalous accusations<sup>4</sup> as that you mention in your letter, yet

<sup>1</sup> The distinction is certainly consonant, to some extent, with the principles of English law. In the case of a lunatic, for instance, who retains till his death any title or property which may accrue to him, the exercise of rights which he cannot employ without danger to the public is usually vested in trustees. (See Burnet, ii. 211 2; this passage probably reflects the sentiments of Halifax.)

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, April 21<sup>st</sup> May 1<sup>st</sup>, pp. 82, 83: 'If my intelligence from England be such as ought to be sent to a statesman abroad, this will find you re-establish'd in your seat at the Privy Councell, in which case I shall give you joy, though I presume other present circumstances of affairs have already given you more since I left you.'

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxxviii., p. 84.

<sup>4</sup> See Henry Savile to Lord Halifax, May 3 (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 83): 'I confess I think you have reason enough to be satisfied with the fall of the late great man from his high station, but I think I understand both your nature and your stile better than to believe the silly story's that are spread here of the jests you made and the triumph you shew'd at his first being brought to the bar of your House, and therefore I take pains to vindicate you, which I find the easier having my Lady Seroope to help me, and I think betwixt us we shall keep your reputation of goodnature as right here as you care to have it, though many of the martyrs have set you down for one of their chief persecutors.' Lady Seroope, daughter of Sir Robert Carr (of Sleaford, Lincolnshire), sister of Lady Holles, and widow of Sir Adrian Seroope, was a Papist; she had the reputation of a wit and a courtier. (See *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 101 note and 131 note.)

1679 I am not so much offended at the lye as I am pleased that my Lady Scroope defendeth me. Pray improve my thanks to her in the best manner, and tell her the right she doth me in her opinion doth more than make amends for all the injustice I can receive from her whole party. The peace of the North being so far advanced maketh our jealousy of France so much the greater: his army being now at liberty, and we having yet provided nothing to secure us but the abilities of our envoyé. I suppose Harry may now be with you if no accident has made his journey slower. I have confined him to ten days or a fortnight's stay in Paris; in which time you will be able to search him, so as to send me his perfect character along with him. And pray take some pains in it, it being of some moment to me that I should not mistake his humour, which is less discoverable by a father than by any other man less concerned. I cannot blame you for fearing a journey with a court; I know few things would give me more terror, but it must be done, and I dare rely upon you for making it as easy to you as the matter will bear. We are here every day upon high points: God send us once at an end of them! Impeachments of ministers,<sup>1</sup> tryalls of peers for their life,<sup>2</sup> discourses and votes too concerning the heir presumptive, are the only things our thoughts are employ'd about. And I that have dream't this half year of the silence and retirement of old Rufford, find myself engaged in an active and an angry world, and must rather take my part in it with grief than avoid it with scandal. Whatever passes is sent to you of course, so that I shall never write any news to you except you bid me. My Lord Sunderland is very kind, and I value his being so to the degree I ought. I need not tell you how much you owe him, but remember it is no small things for men at court to speak kindly of their friends when they are at a distance. I leave you to your triumphs for your great wedding;<sup>3</sup> and that I may close with a pleasing line to you, I was told by a Frenchman that *Monsieur Savile fait les affaires de son maître le plus habilement du monde* Adieu.

The next letter refers to a small diplomatic success which Henry Savile regarded with the most ingenuous delight:—<sup>1</sup>

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>2</sup>

May 1<sup>st</sup>, '79.

I find by y<sup>r</sup> letter to my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland that your nephew is come to Paris, and am not sorry to see you do not altogether

<sup>1</sup> April 25, Lord Danby, prisoner in the Tower, had pleaded his pardon at the bar of the House.

<sup>2</sup> April 21 we find Halifax on a Committee entrusted with business relative to the intended trial of five Popish Peers accused of complicity in the plot.

<sup>3</sup> Of 'Mademoiselle' to the King of Spain.

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, letter lxxi., p. 89.

dislike him. Your opinion of him more at large I expect when he cometh over; in the mean time, though you will hear it from better hands, I will not omitt to tell you that your letter<sup>1</sup> to Mr. Secretary Coventry was read at Councell,<sup>2</sup> where it received so much applause that I hope it will encourage you to deserve more upon all occasions you shall have to send any account of your transactions; and as the best evidence that your dispatch is approved, it hath produced an order<sup>3</sup> which will not only be for your credit and vindication, but will give universal satisfaction to every body here, there being few things that gave more offence than the too familiar admittance of embassadours, especially of those from France, to speak of business to the King. Now, though it happeneth well for your credit here that you are the occasion of having this regulated, yet I hope you will not impute more to yourself in it than is necessary in the place you are in, that you may not draw a disadvantage upon yourself by seeming to resent too much what hath been done to you in relation to your own particular. You see a new councillor will be advising, though whilst I am writing I conclude you will think fit to do this without my putting you in mind of it. We begin to hope the French will not discompose us this year, since it is so far advanced, and that such a diligent watchman as we will suppose you to be doth not give us any alarm of it. There is no need of anything from abroad to give us exercise, being sufficiently employed at home in parl<sup>t</sup>, where things are started every day that will make the world conclude we are in a more quarrelsome humour than I hope will be found when men have had a little time to grow cool. The particulars of everything will be sent to you by my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland, who telleth me he taketh care you may know all we do. I write this whilst we are at councell, which you therefore ought to take kindly, and think I have acquitted myself pretty well to you, though I add no more but that I am, &c.

HALIFAX.

Meanwhile, if the 'Triumvirate' possessed the ascendancy in Council, Lord Shaftesbury, as was equally evident, had gained a preponderating influence in the House of Commons. The expedients favoured by the 'Triumvirate' were rejected in the Commons. On May 11 there

<sup>1</sup> The despatch (says Mr. Cooper's note) is not in the State Paper Office. We find it, however, among the *Loughleat MSS.* under date April 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Savile complains in dignified fashion of the stiffness with which he is treated, and recommends a retaliation on Barillon.

<sup>2</sup> This was a new arrangement (Henry Savile to Secretary Coventry, May 20, *Loughleat MSS.*).

<sup>3</sup> Concerning the reception of Foreign Ministers, at which Savile expressed his delight to Secretary Coventry, June 3 (*Loughleat MSS.*). It was dated May 11, and will be found in the *Dutch Despatches* (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 130).

1679 ensued a critical debate, during which William Coventry declared, like his nephew Halifax, for a policy of limitations;<sup>1</sup> and a 'Bill of Exclusion,' introduced May 15, passed on May 22 the second reading.

Nor was this the only rock ahead. Dissension had arisen between the Houses over the impending trials of Lord Danby and of the Peers who had been accused of participation in the Popish plot.<sup>2</sup> Upon these points the Country party, whether in or out of office, had rallied as one man in favour of severity, and the *majority* in the Lower House had been reinforced by a strong *minority* in the House of Lords, which included Halifax equally with Lord Shaftesbury. But while this united action failed to heal the breach in the party, it exasperated relations between the Houses; and even apart from the question of the exclusion, public business had come to a deadlock. A prorogation, so Temple and the 'Triumvirate' agreed, was the only expedient.<sup>3</sup> They felt certain, counting upon the official members, of a majority in Council;<sup>4</sup> but during Temple's absence the 'Triumvirate,' alarmed by some disquieting rumours, thought it wise to precipitate proceedings by dispensing with a formal discussion.<sup>5</sup>

On May 27 accordingly, without forewarning his Council, Charles, to the fury of the Houses,<sup>6</sup> cut short

<sup>1</sup> His speech is remarkable and statesmanlike. His references to foreign relations and to the parallel afforded by the Isle of Wight negotiations of thirty years earlier are justified by the event.

<sup>2</sup> The 'Country' majority in the Commons asserted that the bishops, who were technically incapable of judging capital cases, were not entitled to vote on the earlier stages of such a trial. Halifax, Shaftesbury, and the 'Country' party in the Lords protested, May 13, against the contrary decision of their own House. Hallam condemns the 'Country' view from the constitutional standpoint, but its practical significance is obvious. The Episcopal Bench, which was almost unanimously in favour of Danby, could, by voting on the validity of the pardon a strictly preliminary question, decide the eventual issue. Other technical difficulties arose, and Halifax, who assisted in the arrangement of the four or five conferences on the subject, twice joined with Shaftesbury, &c., in protesting against the refusal of the House to settle the whole question by means of a joint Committee. It is possible that this co-operation with his uncle led the 'Triumvirate' to approach Shaftesbury and his ally Monmouth (as York suspected, and Temple confesses) on the basis of a banishment for some definite period of the Duke of York. The names of Essex and Halifax are, however, conspicuously absent from three similar protests signed May 23 and 27. The almost immediate rupture of the negotiations may have occurred in the interval.

<sup>3</sup> May 25.

<sup>4</sup> Temple.

<sup>5</sup> The Committee of Intelligence sat May 19 and May 25; Halifax was present on both occasions (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, f. 2).

<sup>6</sup> There is a long despatch on the subject among the *Dutch Despatches* (Open), <sup>May 30</sup> June 9, which is full of interest. This step, say the writers, was at

the session.<sup>1</sup> The rage of Lord Shaftesbury knew no bounds, and, well aware no doubt to whom he should attribute the manœuvre, he swore aloud in the House of Lords that he would have the heads of his Majesty's advisers. These denunciations of course included his nephew Halifax, with whom his rupture thus became final. Nor can we blame the President's resentment; in effect the conduct of the 'Triumvirate' had been impolitic to a degree. The deliberate slights which had been inflicted upon the Council directly contravened the promises with which Charles had inaugurated the new arrangement; it caused an immense amount of unnecessary irritation, and threw upon the 'Triumvirate' the odium of a decision which should have emanated from a substantial majority. Nor did the exasperated President affect to restrain his indignation. 'Spiteful repartees' between uncle and nephew diversified proceedings in Council, and as Monmouth had 'broken all measures with Lord Essex, with whom he had been long in the last confidence,' the Council chamber was the scene of unbridled recrimination.<sup>2</sup> The 'Triumvirate,' however, carried all before it. The prorogation had deprived Shaftesbury of the moral support afforded by his majority in the Lower House; and the King, of course, continued to endorse the policy of the Moderates, whose favour, moreover, now rested on additional foundations of a more personal nature. Temple he had long respected; Sunderland proved a clever administrator and the most supple of courtiers; Essex displayed financial ability under difficult circumstances; while Halifax, to the general surprise, rose rapidly in the Royal favour. His 'lively and libertine'<sup>3</sup> conversation is the charm to which Burnet

1679

first regarded as the herald of an absolute reaction; but conversation with the King and Ministers has convinced them that it had become necessary in consequence of the violence of the Houses, and might be regarded as a merely temporary expedient unconnected with any change of policy (British Museum Add. MSS. 17.677, vol. EE, ff. 146-50).

<sup>1</sup> Before proroguing Charles gave his assent to a Bill for securing the liberty of the subject, better known as the 'Habeas Corpus Bill.' A similar Bill had been pressed for many years, but had invariably succumbed to one of the many unexpected prorogations of that troublous time. The credit of its ultimate passage is generally ascribed to Lord Shaftesbury, but has been placed, as we shall see, to that of Lord Halifax. The *Journals* throw no light on the question. Halifax on one occasion ranked among the managers of a conference in which his uncle took no part; the Lord President reported from two subsequent conferences whence his nephew was absent.

<sup>2</sup> Temple, *Works*, ii. p. 507.

<sup>3</sup> Probably 'sceptical.' The word at the time applied to licentiousness

1679 rather invidiously ascribes the Royal conversion. 'Lord Halifax,' he says, 'studied to manage the King's spirit and gain an ascendant there.'

The policy of the Government therefore during the three months which succeeded must be regarded as the policy of the 'Triumvirate,' and accordingly demands a brief consideration under certain distinctive heads.

#### I. In relation to Popery.

We . . . thought (says Temple <sup>1</sup>) of such acts of council, as might express his majesty's care for suppressing popery even in the intervals of parliament. We only disagreed in one point, which was the leaving some priests to the law upon the accusation of being priests only,<sup>2</sup> as the house of commons had desired;<sup>3</sup> which I thought wholly unjust, without giving them publick warning by proclamation. . . . since the connivances had lasted now through three kings' reigns: upon this point, lord Halifax and I had so sharp a debate at lord Sunderland's lodgings,<sup>4</sup> that he told me, if I would not concur in points which were so necessary for the people's satisfaction, he would tell every body I was a papist: and upon his affirming, that the plot must be handled as if it were true, whether it were so or no, in those points that were so generally believed by city or country as well as both houses; I replied; with some heat, That the plot was a matter long on foot before I came over into England; that to understand it, one must have been here to observe all the motions of it; which not having done, I would have nothing to do with it: in other things I was content to join with them, where they thought I could be of use to the king's service; and where they thought there was none, I was very willing to be excused; and very glad to leave his majesty's affairs in so good hands as theirs.

in religion or philosophic speculation, as well as in morals or conduct. Halifax has left on record his distaste and contempt for indecency of language (*Character of Charles II.*).

<sup>1</sup> *Works* (1770), ii. 506.

<sup>2</sup> Under penal laws which had long been obsolete.

<sup>3</sup> The priests in question were evidently those for whose execution the Commons had addressed (April 27), receiving an ambiguous answer. On May 5, however, Lord Russell had been empowered to inform the House that one of these men, having been convicted of the plot, should be executed; but his reference to the others was designedly evasive (Kennet, iii. 375). But on May 28 the King ordered the execution of four condemned priests (*Dutch Despatches*, <sup>May 30</sup><sub>June 9</sub>, and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, p. 159, June 3). Three priests were executed in July (Kennet, p. 380). Lingard states that in all twenty-four priests were convicted of performing their functions. Eight actually suffered, two of whom had passed their eightieth year.

<sup>4</sup> This conversation must have taken place on May 27 or 28, as the order for the priests' execution issued on the latter day (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 149b).

His remonstrances, however, were vain, and Charles 1679 within a few hours gave orders for the execution of the unfortunate victims.

The incident leaves upon one's mind a singularly disagreeable impression. The execution, without premonitory warning, of laws which have been suspended *in terrorem* hardly deserves perhaps Sir William's epithet of 'unjust,' but it is certainly severe, and especially so when the Acts themselves err upon the side of barbarity. The reputation of Halifax for justice and humanity stands in later years upon so high a plane that we are disappointed to find him advocating the revival of a sanguinary statute at the instance of popular clamour. In justice to Halifax, however, we must refrain from laying undue stress upon the details of a conversation avowedly conducted under the circumstances of mutual irritation,<sup>1</sup> and reported years later by one of the disputing parties; who writes, moreover, under the influence of an intervening alienation.<sup>2</sup> The cynical indifference expressed as to the truth or falsehood of the plot is very unlike the vein of Halifax, and we are convinced that such a sentiment can only be referred to a moment of exasperation, unless—which is perhaps the more likely theory—it results from an unintentional distortion of the speaker's meaning.<sup>3</sup>

His avowed opinion upon the subject of the plot may be read in the following contemporary letter to his brother:—

<sup>1</sup> The incident, however, did not at the time create a quarrel. 'Lords Sunderland and Halifax,' says Temple, 'pressed me extremely about this time to come into the secretary's place, Lord Halifax particularly offering to bring it to a point with his uncle Coventry upon the money that was to be paid; pretending to be very desirous to see me posted there.' We know from Burnet that Halifax himself refused the Secretaryship, and this may account for Temple's rather irrelevant continuation, 'professing to grow weary of the business, since he could find no temper like to grow in the next session of parliament between the king and them' (*Works*, edit. 1770, ii. 507). We may also refer here to the resignation of Sir Thomas Chichele, the step-father of Lord Halifax, the result of personal pique. (See Algernon Sidney to Savile, June  $\frac{1}{2}$ , p. 81.)

<sup>2</sup> The contemporary account in the *Dutch Despatches* (*Open*), <sup>May 30</sup> <sub>June 9</sub>, is as follows: The King has ordered the execution of four priests merely as priests, though there is no precedent for the execution of the statute in this King's reign, 'and also in his Majesty's Council the assent was not unanimous, perhaps with the more reason because about thirty other popish priests here and elsewhere, who are said to be in prison, must be liable to the same punishment' (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 149b).

<sup>3</sup> We are gratified to find that this conjecture has the authority of Hallam in its favour. (See *Constitutional History*, edit. 1850, ii. 149 note: 'We may doubt whether Temple has represented this quite exactly.')



*'Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.'*<sup>1</sup>

1679 I had yours <sup>2</sup> yesterday by the young gentleman, who telleth me he will write this post to you. I find him full of his acknowledgements for your kindness to him, by which you have gain'd a friend, if that were worth any thing. I suspend my judgement till I see more of him; in the mean time I will only tell you I am not discouraged by what I have seen already,<sup>3</sup> and finding him so much leaner<sup>4</sup> than I expected was a welcome disappointment to me. His Madrid complexion<sup>5</sup> I hope will not last always, but that our climate will unbake him, and then his person will be tolerable. But to go on to answer your letter in the several parts of it: You may be assured that whatever I observe in your letters that may be liable to exception you shall know of it, it being an unkind piece of tenderness to conceal anything of that nature. Your next advertisement concerning Tungier &c.,<sup>6</sup> is that which hath been thought of; but whether any good is to be done in the particulars you mention is more than I can at present determine. The objections against S<sup>r</sup> J. L.<sup>7</sup> were offer'd and press'd but without any success. I agree much with you in what you say concerning the Duke,<sup>8</sup> and if the parl<sup>t</sup> had continued I should have had the opportunity of shewing moderation, which was never more advisable for many reasons than upon this occasion. It becomes the zeal of the French clergy to press the King to a persecution by way of revenge upon us here;<sup>9</sup> but I will hope wiser things of the governm<sup>t</sup> there than that so unreasonable a thing should prevail; however, if the fear of it putteth thoughts into the Protestants of removing hither, I am sure we must renounce all good sense if we do not encourage them by all possible invitations. It hath ever been so much my principle that I have wonder'd at our neglecting a thing we ought to seek; and those that have not zeal enough to endeavour it for the preserving our religion might have wit enough to do it for the increasing our

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxxv., p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> *May 26*  
*June 5* (*ibid.* p. 91).

<sup>3</sup> Old Algernon, who seems to have cherished a pathetic attachment for his great nephew, reported to the elder Henry that Lord Halifax was as pleased with his son as either Sidney or Savile could desire. *Letters*, p. 87.

<sup>4</sup> The uncle had feared, at one time, lest his nephew should in girth resemble himself (*ibid.* p. 78).

<sup>5</sup> H. Savile (*ibid.* p. 86) describes his nephew as handsome and gentlemanly, with a complexion like his father's, though tanned by his Spanish voyage.

<sup>6</sup> That they were in Popish hands (*ibid.* p. 92).

<sup>7</sup> John Lanieres, Governor of Jersey (*ibid.* p. 92).

<sup>8</sup> The danger of throwing him into the arms of the French, from whom his zeal for the war had alienated him (*ibid.*).

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 93.

trade. But to think of any greater designs<sup>1</sup> is not fit for our age: we may please ourselves with dreaming of such things, but we must never hope to get further. For that which concerneth an amnesty to the King's subjects that did not obey the King's proclamation the last year,<sup>2</sup> if they are Protestants I think it a very fitt thing, and shall move to have it consider'd. As for the printing Coleman's tryal,<sup>3</sup> I doubt your zeal may go a little too fast in it. You are to consider there are several expressions against popery that his Christian Maj<sup>ty</sup> will never allow to be publish'd by his authority, and to make a request which would be deny'd might be of much worse consequence than the letting it alone; so that you are not to wonder if Mr. Secretary doth not encourage you in a thing he himself doth not approve. I hope the notoriety of the fact, as our lawyers call it, is evidence enough of the plott; and yet it is in vain to hope it will ever be confess'd by those that say still there never was any such thing as the Massacre at Paris, or the Gunpowder Treason in England. The story of your Irish priest<sup>4</sup> is a very odd one, and I shall not conceal it, though we do not need here any further proofs of the good intentions of our popish countrymen abroad. I hope you will use ordinary cautions for your safety in all events; as for extraordinary ones, and such as bring great trouble with them, a man must count ill that thinketh life worth them. You need not much fear the having a chaplain imposed upon you;<sup>5</sup> besides the charge, it would be an incumbance, for which I should pity you; but I do not at all apprehend you will be putt to such a tryal of your patience. I approve y<sup>r</sup> going to Charenton,<sup>6</sup> and your countenancing the Protestants, which I think the principall work of an English minister in France; but I am apt to believe it may make the court there very weary of you, it being a method that they have of late been so little used to that they take it for an injury. This is enough for once, and, being at the bottom of my paper, I will leave you to your better entertainments. Adieu.

II. The foreign policy of the Administration next demands our attention. Here, and here alone, the Ministry was at one: and the very fact that it included both Halifax and Sir William Temple defines the direction of its energies. An alliance with the States<sup>7</sup> became the immediate object; and it was suggested that, by the terms

<sup>1</sup> Such as the King's declaring himself Protector of the Protestants of Europe. (See *Savile Correspondence*, p. 93.)

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Who had threatened revenge upon English Protestants in Paris should the Popish Lords be convicted. (See *ibid.* p. 91.)

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> I.e. to the Protestant 'temple' there.

<sup>7</sup> The *Dutch Despatches* show that within three days of the proffogation the King and Ministers had spoken in the strongest manner of their friendly sentiments towards the States.

1679 of the intended compact, the contracting parties should become jointly responsible for the continued integrity of the Spanish Netherlands.<sup>1</sup> Upon this point even Lord Shaftesbury, for once,<sup>2</sup> coalesced with his colleagues; and a very appropriate agent appeared in the person of Henry Sidney, younger brother of Colonel Algernon. A man of dissipated habits and considerable social gifts, these external characteristics veiled the tact of a diplomatist and some political ability. His connection with the Spencers naturally recommended him to Temple, Halifax, Sunderland, and the President. As colonel of an English regiment in the Dutch service he had gained, to a very remarkable degree, the favour of William, and his attachment to the Prince's service was dignified by a consistency of which the time affords few examples. This had doubtless a personal<sup>3</sup> origin, for principle is not the distinguishing mark of 'Le beau Sydney.'

In addition to his ostensible errand<sup>4</sup> the new envoy was entrusted with a second and more delicate mission. The Moderate party, without abandoning the antagonistic attitude which it had assumed towards the policy of exclusion, seems to have been sceptical as to ultimate

<sup>1</sup> As provided by the treaty of Nimeguen. D'Avaux (June 10<sup>th</sup>) represents this policy as instigated by the Prince of Orange (*Negotiations*, i. 13-18).

<sup>2</sup> Sunderland, whose smooth duplicity enabled him to keep terms with all men, had not come to an open breach with Shaftesbury, and the latter spoke of him in amicable terms. Sunderland tried to induce his colleagues to employ the President - at least, as a tool. Halifax retorted 'he was confident there would never be any good done with that man.' The references of Shaftesbury to Essex and Halifax were equally slighting (Henry Sidney, *Diary*, July 17, i. 28).

<sup>3</sup> His passion for the first Duchess of York, though not reciprocated, had occasioned his own disgrace, and aroused the lasting resentment of her husband.

<sup>4</sup> The 'Committee' notes in Add. MSS. 15,643 (British Museum) give some valuable data. Sidney was probably proposed at the Committee, June 1, and formally selected June 8. On the 15th it was settled that he should be empowered to suspend the execution of any instructions he might receive, should the Prince so desire it, until he should have communicated with England. He was directed to court Van Beuning's society. On the 17th a project of Guarantee was read, and on the 18th it was approved by the King. Essex and Sunderland were empowered to examine the Dutch Ambassador as to whether he had power to conclude the negotiation. On the 20th they reported that he was not so empowered, nor could be until after the meeting of the States on July 6. He had expressed an opinion that, much as the States desired a closer bond between themselves and England, they might hesitate until peace should be concluded between France and Brandenburg, and the French troops withdrawn from the Duchy of Cleves. The Lords of the Committee moved the King to write to his nephew on the subject. Halifax was present at all these meetings (ff. 6-10). (See also *Secret Dutch Despatches*, June 10<sup>th</sup>, June 20<sup>th</sup>, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888, ff. 257-61.)

success. Its members anticipated defeat; and saw that 1679 should the Bill, despite all opposition, eventually pass, the presence and popularity of the Duke of Monmouth must give to his pretensions a very undesirable impetus. Sunderland, Temple, and Sidney himself became anxious that the Prince of Orange should ingratiate himself with both people and Parliament,<sup>1</sup> and it was proposed that in preparation for an immediate visit he should be created Duke of Gloucester and a Privy Councillor. Halifax, independently of the rest, suggested a similar scheme,<sup>2</sup> and Sidney undertook to press the project upon the attention of the Prince (June 22).

The departure of the diplomatist was precipitated<sup>3</sup> by a very characteristic incident. The Ministry saw reason to suppose that the Sovereign, in defiance of its avowed policy, had engaged in a secret negotiation with the French Ambassador.<sup>4</sup> The surmise seems to have been actually correct. A secret treaty had been proposed on the basis of a three years' pension, a three years' alliance, and a three years' intermission of Parliament.<sup>5</sup> The Duke of York from his exile in Brussels encouraged the conspiracy, and before the collapse of the intrigue during the following November the unscrupulous Sunderland, who in public expressed a peculiar solicitude for the Dutch alliance,<sup>6</sup> had become deeply implicated.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Temple (in his *Memoirs*) does not mention this episode, nor his own rather wild scheme of compensating the Duke of York by procuring his election as King of the Romans. We owe our information to Henry Sidney. This remarkable incident is also mentioned, though with much exaggeration, in the *Negotiations of d'Avaux* (i. 44): 'Je confirmai au Roi par ma Lettre du 19 Octobre 1679, les avis que je lui avois déjà donnés, que le Prince d'Orange songeoit à se faire appeller à la succession d'Angleterre, à l'exclusion de M. le duc d'York; que M. Temple l'entretenoit dans cette espérance; & que je ne savois encore si c'étoit Sidney Envoyé du Roi d'Angleterre à la Haye . . . qui faisoit cette Négociation.'

<sup>2</sup> Halifax gave strong evidence of his attachment to the Prince's interest. Henry Sidney, on the day upon which he heard of his appointment, walked with Halifax and Essex, who 'spoke much to the advantage of the Prince.' On another occasion Halifax told Sidney that each of the Ministers 'must have some private' (conversation with him concerning the Prince; and he allowed) 'that every honest man would be for him unless he were a madman, meaning the setting up of popery and arbitrary government' (*Diary*, June 1 and 22; Blencowe, i. 1, 13).

<sup>3</sup> July 21.

<sup>4</sup> Private intercourse between foreign Ambassadors and the King had been forbidden by the new Privy Council, in retaliation, and at the instance of Henry Savile. (See Dalrymple's *Memoirs*, i. 311; Henry Savile to Henry Coventry, April 22, June 3, *Longleat MSS.*; *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 89, 90; *Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 230a.)

<sup>5</sup> Dalrymple, i. 316-27.

<sup>6</sup> See Henry Sidney, *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> These intrigues were suspected by the Dutch Ambassador (*Dutch*

1679 III. The policy of the Triumvirate with regard to Scotland must now detain us. That kingdom was known to be seething with political discontent. The tyranny and misgovernment of Secretary Lauderdale and the cruelty of the repressive policy which he had adopted towards the Presbyterians were matters of notoriety, and had disgusted English opinion of almost every grade. Temple had urged, though in vain, his omission from the reorganised Privy Council; the Commons had addressed, equally in vain, for his removal; while the murder of Archbishop Sharp shortly before the prorogation had thrown a fresh and lurid light upon the actual situation. A deputation of Scotch noblemen, primed with complaints of the gravest description, now settled in London, and obtained<sup>1</sup> the promise of a hearing by counsel, to take place in presence of the King, of Lord Halifax, and of Lord Essex.<sup>2</sup> The King, charmed by the idea of substituting<sup>3</sup> the Duke of Monmouth<sup>4</sup> for the hated Scotchman, was understood to waver in his support; but while the matter impended, startling intelligence arrived. A chance encounter between a party of soldiers and the armed members of a field conventicle had 'set fire to the heather;' and but a few days elapsed ere the 'Whig' zealots of the south-western shires were in arms. The news reached London June 8 during a sitting of the Privy Council.<sup>5</sup> Russell started to his feet, and amid general approval denounced Lord Lauderdale as the true author of the revolt. 'Sit down, my Lord,' cried Charles with a sneer; '*this* is no place for addresses.' But at a second council held the same day remonstrances no less forcible resounded on every side; while Halifax and Temple, indignant at the King's unblushing patronage of Lauderdale, even threatened to resign. Nor were matters improved when his Majesty announced that he should commit to the Duke of Monmouth the charge of repressing the rebellion, and should create him, with this object, Commander-in-Chief for Scotland as well as for England. The Moderates realised to the full the danger of concentrating such extensive authority in the hands of an ambitious pretender;<sup>6</sup> while, on the other hand, it was

*Despatches*) and by Algernon Sidney, who was in indirect correspondence with the French Ambassador at The Hague (*Negotiations of d'Avaux*, i. 14, 15).

<sup>1</sup> Juhe 6.    <sup>2</sup> See Henry Sidney, *Diary*, i. p. 4.    <sup>3</sup> See Burnet, ii. 229.

<sup>4</sup> He possessed *jure uxoris* vast estates in Scotland.

<sup>5</sup> See Henry Sidney, *Diary*, i. p. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Temple, *Works*, ii. p. 518.

evident to the penetration of Lord Shaftesbury that the task of suppressing a rising to which the harshness of Lauderdale had so directly contributed was, to say the least, invidious.<sup>1</sup> But Charles had determined, and on June 15 the young general started North amid universal expectation.

We must now glance at the private papers of Lord Halifax, as they bear upon these events.

With Sir William Coventry Lord Halifax maintained a regular correspondence. The knight<sup>2</sup> showed special concern for the Scotch embarrassments and their solution: 'till I heare that,' he says,<sup>3</sup> 'I shall scarce expect to heare what you resolve as to a Rufford journey.' He expresses great interest in the arrival of his young nephew from the Continent, and hopes it may console Halifax for 'some other cares' which, Sir William fears, are 'growing to bee strong and weighty' upon his correspondent. 'I assure you,' he says, 'it has a great share in my wishes, that if you cannot doe us all the good you would, you may y<sup>e</sup> selfe receive noe harme.'

By June 16 Coventry foresees the indefinite postponement of the Viscount's departure for the country, and accepts, very provisionally, an invitation to Rufford. He comments on the extraordinary absence of news from Scotland.<sup>4</sup> 'What ever,' he adds, 'ye issue bee, it is a very unseasonable businesse to ye government w<sup>th</sup> puts it to such an expense, & will besides bee an additional argument against ye late prorogation. I confesse I wonder if my Lord Lauderdale doe not desire of himselfe to retire, for certainly this cannot end w<sup>th</sup> any good to him, if hee stand it out. . . .' He suggests that a small frigate or two might well be stationed in St. George's Channel, to prevent the furnishing of arms to the rebels by sympathisers in Ulster.

The letter next to date is from Halifax himself to his brother, and, like most of that series, is devoid to a singular degree of political intelligence. Instinctive circumspection,<sup>5</sup> with a distrust, extremely well founded, of the international postal arrangements, may explain this

<sup>1</sup> Temple, *Works*, ii. p. 509, and Algernon Sidney.

<sup>2</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (25).

<sup>3</sup> June 11.

<sup>4</sup> See A. Sidney to Savile, June 16<sup>th</sup>. Lauderdale was considered responsible.

<sup>5</sup> The portentous reticence of the new Councillors, says Algernon Sidney, makes it hard to forbear laughing; 'but none is so ingenious as to be content men should do it, except the Lord Halifax, who is sometimes free enough with his Companions to begin' (*Letters*, July 19<sup>th</sup>, p. 127).

1679 reserve; but we suspect, moreover, a lingering doubt as to the discretion of the family scapegrace.<sup>1</sup>

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>2</sup>

June 1<sup>st</sup>/<sub>25</sub>th, '79.

The gentleman that brought you one of mine not keeping his day promised to call upon me again for another, which I writ and he never came for it, so that I will send it you by the post. Our fears in relation to Scotland lessen every day, for, though the rebels are together in a body to a considerable number, yet they being so ill arm'd and disciplin'd, it is to be presumed that the King's forces, which now are 10,000 men, will not find much difficulty in suppressing them. The D. of Monmouth is by this time at Edinburgh, and it is hoped that we may have such an account from thence by the next express as may make our preparations here unnecessary. When this storm is allay'd, the King intendeth to go to Windsor, and I have it in my thoughts, though it is not without some doubt, to make a short visit to poor old Rufford; for which my passion increaseth proportionably to the difficulties that arise in getting to it. The peace concluded with the Elector of Brandenburg maketh France the more terrible, now it is absolutely at leisure to do whatever their own strength or their neighbours' weakness may tempt them to do. I am interrupted whilst I am writing this to you, so that I make an end something sooner than I intended, though I have nothing at present to say that you should lament my omitting it. Yours.

On the 25th, three days after date, arrived news<sup>3</sup> of the Duke of Monmouth's victory at Bothwell Bridge, which put an end to the rebellion.

'My deare Lord,' writes Sir William Coventry on the 29th,<sup>4</sup> 'I have just now receaved y<sup>rs</sup> of 26 & had yesterday the good newes of the Subduing ye Scots. I am glad you have soe much time to look about you, but the subduing a faction like that does not doe the businesse, there must bee other measures taken or else, the same or worse will return againe not presently but perhaps two years hence . . . but I will not meddle in State matters.'

<sup>1</sup> Poor Harry seems to have found Lord Sunderland no less remiss, and laments in pathetic terms the extreme ignorance of affairs under which he habitually laboured. 'I wish I had known some of your brother Tho's

kind Machiavellian would tell me where I am, for I protest I am ignora all most everything' (letter to Henry Thynne, June 14, *Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxxviii., p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Henry Sidney, i. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Spencer, MSS.* 31 (25).

He is anxious for 'lights' as to the probable date of the session, and without, as he interpolates, any curiosity concerning 'secrets which ought not to be revealed,' he ventures to presume that the defeat of the Scots has eliminated all motives for hesitation or a further delay. 1679

The question which thus occupied his mind was at the moment under discussion at Court. A rather startling decision had taken form. Charles, Temple, and the 'Triumvirate' had determined upon dissolving the five months' Parliament as the preliminary to calling a new one.

The origin of these tactics is variously explained. Common fame, as represented by Burnet, ascribed the policy to the King, and believed that his authority inspired the acquiescence of Halifax and Essex. But Temple<sup>1</sup> is explicit to the contrary. The Duke of Monmouth, he says, in consequence of his Northern success had become greater than ever; 'lord Shaftesbury reckoned upon being so too, upon the next meeting of parliament, and at the cost of those, whom he took to be the authors of the last prorogation; lord Essex and Halifax looked upon themselves as most in his danger . . . This induced a consultation among us' (to the above effect) ' . . . and the king was perfectly of the same mind.' It was settled that at the next meeting of the Privy Council the King should propose a question, 'Whether parliament be further prorogued or dissolved;' and it was calculated that if the King's own party (Chancellor, Chief Justice, Secretary Coventry, &c.) and the friends of the 'Triumvirate' had been duly primed, 'there could not be above six<sup>2</sup> in the whole Council against' the proposal. This arrangement probably coincided with the King's retirement to Windsor, which took place on June 30,<sup>3</sup> under a stipulation that he should meet the Council on fixed days at Hampton Court. Temple went down to Sheen, which he only deserted on Council days; the other three Lords remained in London, whence they paid flying visits<sup>4</sup> to

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ii. 509 (edit. 1770).

<sup>2</sup> Of this number Russell and Shaftesbury certainly constituted two, Salisbury probably a third.

Henry Sidney, *Diary* (edit. Blencowe, i. 20).

<sup>4</sup> 'The three lords,' Temple says, 'came often to me, and pressed me as often to come as they did to court, and lord Halifax protested he would burn my house, and that, if I would not enter upon the secretary's office, his uncle Coventry would look out for some other chapman; for as soon as he had found one, he was resolved to part with it. I told him I was very willing,' &c. (*Works*, edit. 1770, ii. 509).



1679 Windsor, and to them, together with the King himself, Temple, as he tells us, left the charge of instructing a majority. The critical day arrived (July 3),<sup>1</sup> and one can imagine the disgust of Temple, who describes the whole scene very graphically, as it dawned upon him that through negligence or forgetfulness the subject had not been broached to a single member of the Council. Charles, as prearranged, initiated the discussion. 'I observed,' says Temple, 'a general surprise at the board.' After a long silence the Chancellor arose 'and spoke long and violently against the dissolution.' He was followed by Lord Shaftesbury, who 'in the amplest manner and most tragical terms' supported his amendment. Their opposition excited the almost unanimous approval of a meeting unusually numerous. Courtiers, Moderates, and Exclusionists—all, with the exception of Temple and the 'Triumvirate,' concurred in disapproval. Temple, furiously irritated, could only refer himself to his Majesty; Charles forthwith declared for the dissolution; 'and thereupon the Council broke up with the greatest rage in the world of the lord Shaftesbury, lord Russell, and two or three more, and the general dissatisfaction of the whole board.'<sup>2</sup>

This blunder, ascribe it to whom we may, was fatal. It concentrated upon Temple and the Triumvirate whatever unpopularity might accrue, and excited to an equal degree the animus of courtier and extremist. The final arrangements remained in a necessary abeyance till the date of the ensuing Council, a week later; and in order to secure, as against the dissolution, the interest of the Duke of Monmouth, who was daily expected, a determined attempt<sup>3</sup> was made to defer the day. The pretext was a wedding between a niece of Henry Coventry and the eldest son of the Marquis of Winchester,<sup>4</sup> which was to take place with great festivities on the 10th.<sup>5</sup> Henry Coventry was the mouthpiece of the malcontents,<sup>6</sup> Lord Halifax acting as intermediary.

<sup>1</sup> Henry Sidney, i. 21.

<sup>2</sup> North's *Examen* (pp. 506, 538) oddly and erroneously ascribes this dissolution to the influence of Essex, as exerted in favour of the 'Country' party.

<sup>3</sup> Henry Sidney, July 8, i. 23.

<sup>4</sup> A Privy Councillor.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 473.

<sup>6</sup> His letter to Halifax, dated July 4, is catalogued among a section of the Devonshire papers which has been mislaid.

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Coventry.<sup>1</sup>*

For the right Hon<sup>ble</sup> Henry Coventry secretary of State to 1679 his Ma<sup>ty</sup>—to bee left at his office at Whitehall.

July 5. 79.

S<sup>r</sup>,— To the first part of your letter, the King sayeth hee hath sent order that the men which were lately put into Carlisle should bee dismissed.

For the other proposall you made by order of the Councell board, to put off the next Councell day on consideration of the wedding, his Ma<sup>ty</sup> doth not consent to it, the reason of our meeting then being of that importance, that hee doth not think any private reason of weight enough to put it of; I have obeyed you and the board in making the motion, and hope you will not impute it to mee that I have not succeeded in it.

For what concerneth Count Egmonts request about Mr. Collins,<sup>2</sup> the King sayeth hee will resolve somewhat in it, when hee hath spoken with my L<sup>d</sup> Chancellour and L<sup>d</sup> Privy Seal who are to bee here tomorrow; my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland went from hence yesterday to his own house, and will not returne till Wednesday night,<sup>3</sup> in the mean time, any commands you send mee whilst I stay, which is uncertaine, shall bee obeyed; and when I come to town I shall wish to find you there, that I may have a quarter of an houres discourse with you; but if you shall bee at your lodge,<sup>4</sup> as it is most likely you will bee troubled with mee there. Till then I leave you to your country pleasures, without the least mixture of envy, which is a sufficient evidence of my being

Dear S<sup>r</sup>

your most affectionate Nephew and humble servant

HALIFAX

Lord Halifax returned to London on the 6th or 7th, and wrote as follows in answer to a letter<sup>5</sup> of his brother dated <sup>June 25</sup> July 5:—

*Viscount Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>6</sup>*

London, July 7<sup>th</sup> 79.

My being at Windsor since I had your last hath made my answer so slow to you, and to do it now in method, I must tell you as to your first point concerning my journey to Rufford, that I doubt you may spare your envy to me for it, since I am likely to make none, or so very short a one as will only serve to grieve me for not being able to make it longer. Your nephew seemeth to be in great impatience till he seeth it, and I think there is no better receipt to make him love it than the taking

<sup>1</sup> *Longleat MSS.*, Secretary Coventry's papers.

<sup>2</sup> His chaplain, then in Newgate (Coventry's letter, as catalogued).

<sup>3</sup> The eve of the Council.

<sup>4</sup> His house in Enfield Chase.

<sup>5</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 105.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, letter lxxxii., p. 106.

1679 care he may not be cloy'd with it. I hope we shall both joyn in justifying our usurpation against the Benedictines, and, how little zealous soever we may be in other respects, we may be relyed upon, from our tenure, to be most unmovable Protestants. I cannot blame you for being a little stirr'd to see men's unbelief so ill placed as to think there is no plott here.<sup>1</sup> There are late evidences very material to justify Mr. Ireland's being in town at the time Mr. Oates said he was, and yet that was the principal thing insisted upon by the papists to blemish his testimony. How you and my Lady Scroope can agree upon this matter I am not able to imagine, and especially to live in the same house, which maketh the wonder great. Here is lately come out in print, amongst other libels, an 'Advice to a Painter,' which was written some years since and went about, but now by the liberty of the press is made publick, which for many reasons I am sorry for.<sup>2</sup> The Scotch lords are to be heard to-morrow morning, and the King hath appointed me amongst others to be present at it. The D. of Monmouth hath leave to come back, all being now very quiet in Scotland. My L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland being absent at Althrope, whilst your letter came to him at Windsor, I took the liberty to open it,<sup>3</sup> not knowing but it might have something in it proper to acquaint the King with; but, there being nothing but what relates to the governor, I thought it might keep cold, and shall take care to deliver it to my l<sup>d</sup> when he returneth, which will be next Wednesday. I hear you have been in some fears you might be supplanted by an embassadour, but my l<sup>d</sup> telleth me he sent you the King's answer to put your thoughts at quiet in that particular. Here is Monsieur Flamarin from Monsieur, to give notice of Mademoiselle's marriage,<sup>4</sup> but I do not find he saw you before he came from Paris, which I thought was to be of course upon such occasions. Next Thursday at Hampton Court, the resolution will be taken about the time of meeting of the parl<sup>t</sup>; in the mean time I leave you to the enjoyment of your beloved town of Paris, and so kiss y<sup>r</sup> hands.

The hearing of the Scotch Lords to which Halifax

<sup>1</sup> Yet the acquittal of Wakenham had just given the first serious blow to the vitality of the legend.

<sup>2</sup> Both the Coventrys are satirised in Marvell's poem which bears this title (1667).

<sup>3</sup> In his answer Savile expresses his pleasure at the visits of his brother to Windsor, and fancies that the newness of that scene, 'considering your long absence from thence' may compensate those hankerings after Rufford which the envoy does not regard as overwhelmingly poignant. 'Nor am I,' he adds, 'less glad to find you a kind of deputy Secretary of State in the absence of my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland, as well because of the intimacy it shews to be betwixt you, as because it is a good omen for preferment, for I remember my Lord Clifford was so to my L<sup>d</sup> Arlington when he went into Holland' (in 1672) 'and was Lord Treasurer six months after' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 108).

<sup>4</sup> To the King of Spain; she was, of course, niece to the English king.

thus refers took place on the morrow,<sup>1</sup> as arranged, in 1679 presence of Lord Essex and Lord Halifax, who no doubt went down to Windsor for the purpose. It lasted eight hours;<sup>2</sup> Essex and Halifax spoke warily for the complainants, who had the sympathy of almost everyone present. Halifax in especial distinguished himself, animadverting upon acts of flagrant illegality, which their abettors could only defend by pleading prerogative. 'Amongst other things,' says Algernon Sidney,<sup>3</sup> 'he told the King he saw the Scottish nation was more free than the English.'<sup>4</sup> The petitioners, as the two Lords told Burnet, proved their case to demonstration; but Charles with cool effrontery maintained that while '*many damned things*' had been objected against Lauderdale, nothing had been advanced *which was detrimental to his own service*.

Three days later dawned the eventful Thursday, and Lord Halifax went down to Hampton Court for the meeting in company with Sunderland and Henry Sidney.<sup>5</sup> Rumours of an impending dissolution were already rife, and the friends concluded that the Lord Chancellor had betrayed their secret.<sup>6</sup>

During the sitting which ensued the Duke of Monmouth arrived from Scotland. He had played his cards extremely well, having contrived at once to enhance his military reputation and to obtain, by his humane and sympathetic treatment of the vanquished, an enthusiastic popularity. As regards the point at issue, Charles reasserted his authority. The dissolution became a certainty, together with the immediate issue of writs for the purposes of an autumn session.

By the evening of that day the news had become public property. Lord Halifax, it would seem, gave Sir William Coventry a direct intimation. The knight meanwhile addressed him as follows in a letter<sup>7</sup> which anticipated his own:—

. . . I cannot but tell you of a clause w<sup>ch</sup> I saw in a letter written on ye 8 instant to this effect. Everybody concludes ye

<sup>1</sup> July 8.

<sup>2</sup> Wodrow (edit. 1829-30), iii. 169.

<sup>3</sup> To Savile, July 16, *Letters*, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> Meaning, we presume, that the laws, if justly executed, were more tender of individual freedom. The assertion seems open to doubt; but it appears certain that Scotch writers were apt to make very extensive claims as regards the theoretical powers of Parliament. (See Somerville, p. 242.)

<sup>5</sup> *Diary*, i. 25.

<sup>6</sup> 'Lord Halifax said, nobody knew it on Tuesday; that the Lord Chancellor went, and on Wednesday, everybody knew it.'

<sup>7</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (25), July 12.

1679 Par<sup>t</sup> will not meet in Aug: but because of a very secret councill held last Sunday at Windsor, where neither Secretary of State nor President of ye Councill were present, there is much whispering as if ye Par<sup>t</sup> would be dissolved. I repeat this as neere as I can to you, for this reason that you may see what remarks are made upon secret consultations; & w<sup>th</sup> all to adde my wishes that, since you were at Windsor, you were not one of this very private councill. I cannot say too often to you, for whom I have soe much concerne, Beware of y<sup>e</sup> reputation of a Minister,<sup>1</sup> it is ye worst place (for a man in y<sup>r</sup> circumstances) betweene Berwicke & ye Mount in Cornewall. When I had written what is on ye other side & was walking amongst my Cabages, comes yours of 10th. w<sup>th</sup> the newes of the dissolution of ye Par<sup>t</sup> very welcome to my particular, & whether better or worse to the publicke is not my part to dispute especially at this distance from ye true lights of things, though possibly one tryall more might have prepared better for a new Eleccion.

As to y<sup>r</sup> arguments to my particular<sup>2</sup> I will not reply now, it is fitter for discourse (&c.)

Thomas Thynne, cousin and follower of Lord Halifax, was no less perturbed, and expressed his forebodings with far more bluntness than Sir William.<sup>3</sup>

July ye 12th '79.

My most honoured Lord I had not presumed to importune yr Lp, who have soe many weighty affaires in y<sup>r</sup> hands, did not Thursdays declaration startle all ye world, and therefore in soe surprising a businesse none so capable of satisfying a poor countryman as yr Lp. who are both able, and obliging enough to doe it. Out of what quiver this arrowe comes, I am not prophet enough to divine, this P. Councill could not certainly advise the parting with a Parl<sup>t</sup> since it<sup>4</sup> was created onely to gratifie it,<sup>5</sup> and who else could have interest or power enough to doe it I cannot guesse. possibly L<sup>d</sup> Danby may hope for a reprieve from a new one, pardon he can have from none, but then it must bee composed of Presbyterians and sectaries, w<sup>ch</sup> if they save ye man, will infallibly undoe ye Mr. but I had hoped his tedder<sup>6</sup> could not have reacht from ye Tower to Windsor. As to ye Duke, I verily believe they had Spent their powder, and would have accepted of what was offered, but whether a new one will bee soe wise, till they have wearied themselves, as ye last did I much doubt. but since ye die is cast it will be in my poor opinion, very adviseable to print a declaration of ye causes of ye dissolution, with a narrative of ye King's offers

<sup>1</sup> I.e. Prime or Sole Minister.

<sup>2</sup> Evidently Lord Halifax had urged him to stand again.

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (51).

<sup>4</sup> The Council.

<sup>5</sup> The Parliament.

<sup>6</sup> i.e. tether; of which it is the earlier and more correct form (Skeat).

and our proceedings, for I can assure y<sup>r</sup> Lp. the countreys<sup>1</sup> are 1679  
 very ignorant of the truth of things, their Parl<sup>t</sup> men possessing  
 them with strange stories to iustifie their owne actings I knowe  
 all excuses and Defenses seeme to admit of faults, but in this  
 case, and since another Parl<sup>t</sup> is to bee called I thinke somewhat  
 of that nature necessary, especially since his Mat<sup>ie</sup> seems re-  
 solved to redresse all reall grievances, as ye executing the  
 Jesuits<sup>2</sup> makes me believe he is. The Judges in their charges at  
 the Assizes should bee instructed to informe the countreyes of  
 his Mat<sup>ies</sup> good intentions; and of his desires to ioyn with his  
 people, y<sup>n</sup> will pardon this impertinence of mine, but y<sup>r</sup> Lp  
 knowes I never had, nor ever will have any other designes.  
 then those y<sup>n</sup> have approved by y<sup>r</sup> example. And now my  
 Lord, though I have bin very tedious, give me leave to speake  
 somewhat of my selfe. I have sate in two Parlt. and have had  
 ye hard fortune, in ye first to displease the Court, in ye second  
 ye Country, wherby I perceive those who act by principle, are  
 not fit for Parlt. and therefore resolve to be quiet now, and expect  
 ye issue with patience but ye little interest I have shall be em-  
 ployed to send up such as shall be True to ye Governmt., and  
 equally averse to Anarchy and Tyranny. I would be glad to  
 heare, whether our friends designe to stand againe, such as  
 S<sup>r</sup> W<sup>m</sup> Hickman, S<sup>r</sup> T. Clerges &c. I hope Mr Savile<sup>3</sup> will  
 succeed Mr White.<sup>4</sup> I thinke this will be ye last Parl<sup>t</sup> if it bee  
 not a good one, and therefore wish all good men in it. Dear Lord,  
 forgive this horrid impertinence, and believe me to be most  
 sincerely yr Lps most obedient faithfull servant

THO THYNNE.

These suggestive letters forestall in the mildest  
 fashion the storm which ensued, for the fears of Sir  
 William and Mr. Thynne were abundantly justified. The  
 certain news of the dissolution, as we have already  
 observed, reached London on the afternoon of the 10th.  
 Shaftesbury and his friends emphatically disavowed the  
 policy,<sup>5</sup> and Henry Sidney records that general discourse  
 concerning the promoters took its tone from these censures,  
 and was, in fact, 'most railing.' 'This business,' writes  
 Algernon Sidney to Henry Savile,<sup>6</sup> 'is wholly imputed unto  
 your two friends,<sup>7</sup> and the other<sup>8</sup> that ever joins with  
 them; but the King finding it would not pass at Council,  
 takes it wholly upon himself . . . the three above mentioned,

<sup>1</sup> I.e. counties, or country districts; a common form of speech at the time.

<sup>2</sup> Accused of participation in the plot. (See Lingard 5th edit., vol. ix. p. 440 [June 20].)

<sup>3</sup> Probably the son and heir.

<sup>4</sup> Member for Nottinghamshire.

<sup>5</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Open)*, July 15, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 186.

<sup>6</sup> July 16, *Letters*, p. 134.

<sup>7</sup> Lords Halifax and Sunderland.

<sup>8</sup> Lord Essex.

1679 . . . begin to be spoken of all over England in the same manner as Danby, and I fear, may be impeached the next Parliament upon this point, and the War in Scotland.’<sup>1</sup>

The general odium was increased, in the case of Halifax, by an extremely unfortunate coincidence. Five days later, July 17, Charles declared in Council<sup>2</sup> the promotion of Halifax to the rank of Earl;<sup>3</sup> and this advancement was, of course, described in common parlance as ‘the reward of his good counsel.’<sup>4</sup> An immediate reason for the distinction may be sought in the fact that on the same day similar dignity was conferred upon Lord Gerrard, a friend of the Duke of Monmouth: and as a counterpoise the step might have claimed, under other circumstances, some political fitness. But the moment was not propitious. The fondness, moreover, of Halifax for honorary distinctions seems to have afforded in his own day a welcome topic for satire. ‘When he talked to me’ (says Burnet), ‘as a philosopher, of his contempt of the world, I asked him what he meant by getting so many new titles, which I called the hanging himself about with bells and tinsel. He had no other excuse for it, but this, that, since the world were such fools as to value these matters, a man must be a fool for company: he considered them but as rattles: yet rattles please children: so these might be of use to his family. *His heart was much set on raising his family*’ ‘In this way,’ says Macaulay,<sup>5</sup> ‘he tried to gratify at once his intellectual vanity and his more vulgar ambition.’ The accusation of a titular ‘greed,’ elsewhere formulated by the historian, may be dismissed as a touch of the true Macaulay rhetoric: but the sarcasm, taken as a whole, is not undeserved. The man who in the course of his life accepts with undisguised satisfaction three hereditary titles has forfeited all right to indulge in the amiable platitudes of Republican pedantry, and cannot without affectation contend that ‘Titles and Honours . . . being hereditary in Europe did take off a great deal of their worth. That if men must raise their own Dignity, they would first endeavor to raise their own virtue: And that by the same reason that Knights Bannerets were all,

<sup>1</sup> ‘As is said contrary to an act Parliament in the year 1641.’

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 495.

<sup>3</sup> See Patent Rolls, 31 Car. II. part 7, No. 3 (July 16). The preamble of the patent refers to the prudence and integrity of Halifax, and to his acceptable and faithful services.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. i. 492, 493, edit. 1833.

<sup>6</sup> *Essays* (5th edit.), iii. 84.

men of valor, because none but for valor were made such 1679  
Knights, Noblemen would all be men of honor indeed, if  
none but for honorable actions were made Nobles.'<sup>1</sup>

Burnet shows considerable acumen in ascribing the aristocratic yearnings of Halifax to an ambition rather family than personal. The blood of Savile and Wentworth could hardly fail to produce a strain in which the instinct of race was predominant; and as head of one of the oldest among the great Yorkshire clans Lord Halifax was unable to repress an inherent passion for its aggrandisement, which, from a philosophic point of view, he could not easily justify.

How Lord Halifax at the moment professed to regard his new honour we shall see in the following letters:—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>2</sup>

July 15th, '79.

I had sent you the first newes of the dissolution of the parliament, but that H. Thynne promised to do it, so that I relyed upon him, and I suppose he did not fail you. It is to be presumed you make comments upon it at Paris, as we do at London, though not just the same; and you may be sure that those who are near the King have their share of the censure that ever attendeth things of this nature. You would think it a strange thing to have it from other hands, and not from mine, that the King, resolving to add my L<sup>d</sup> Roberts and my L<sup>d</sup> Gerrard to the Earles' bench, hath thought fitt to let me keep them company. I keep the same name still, and intend your nephew shall take that of the barony, which is Eland: if any young woman that is a good match may be found that can be fool enough to like him the better for it, this piece of preferment hath something in it, else it is to me of very little moment more than as it is a mark of the King's favour, which maketh everything valuable. I am often at Windsor, where much of the time is taken up about your friend my L<sup>d</sup> Lauderdale, who is defending himself against the Scotch Lords, who have brought up their lawyers to report their complaints; and, though perhaps after the hearing<sup>3</sup> they have had all things will not proceed so as they might expect in relation to their own particulars, yet it is believed they will have the satisfaction of seeing their great adversary removed, but when and in what manner is a thing of more uncertainty. Our cousin Coventry is marry'd to L<sup>d</sup> Wiltshire, and the wedding kept with great solemnity according to the fashion of old England. I do not find your nephew hath any great stomach to matrimony, and I am inclined to let him follow

<sup>1</sup> *Saviliana*.

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxxxiv., p. 109.

<sup>3</sup> By the influence of Monmouth they had obtained a second hearing on the 13th.



1679 his own genius, having so many years before him, that he may throw away a little time with the less disadvantage. There is nothing to tell you from hence worth the making this longer, and so I take my leave. Yours.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

Windsor, July 28th, '79.  
Aug. 7th,

The first thing I am to tell you now is that your bill is accepted; of which I suppose you would not make any doubt no more than you will of my endeavours to assist in getting you an extraordinary supply for the present occasion, if they had been necessary, but my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland and the rest of your friends have been so kind that they presently<sup>2</sup> allow'd your request to be reasonable; and have before this sent you their opinion, that your best way is to lay out what is necessary, and put it upon y<sup>r</sup> extraordinaries.<sup>3</sup> I have spoken to Mr. Brisban,<sup>4</sup> who is very well satisfy'd with your manner of living with him, and, as he is full of his expressions of kindness to you, I have taken care he may not think you behind hand with him in that particular. The man seemeth to deserve every body's esteem, and I believe is so fit for employment that it will be no discredit for any body to recommend him. Monsieur Flammardin assured me he would wait upon you at his return, and that I presume will atone for his former omission. I congratulate the good agreement like to be between you and my Lady Seroope, and it is the more commendable, because there is nothing but Christian charity that can be the inducement to it; I hope you will laugh one another out of your great zeal, and conclude she is no more earnest for Rome than you are for Charenton. The parl<sup>l</sup><sup>5</sup> here is put off for ten days longer, for which other reasons are given out, but the true one is Newmarket. My L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland is gone for a week to Althrope, and I stay here till he returneth. My small tenement is so remote that I cannot so easily divert myself with such small journeys, and I now begin to doubt the summer will pass without my seeing poor old Rufford, now that I have made it deserve a visit better than ever it did before.<sup>6</sup> If I had my choice free, I should prefer being there before this place with all its glory. There is a certain charm in that we call our own that maketh us value it above its true price; but I must lye under the mortification of an absent lover,<sup>7</sup> and am not like to give any other expression at present of my kindness

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxxxvii., p. 114.    <sup>2</sup> I.e. immediately.

<sup>3</sup> All this part of the letter relates to extra allowances required for the festivities consequent on the Spanish match. (See *Savile's* own letters, *passim*.)

<sup>4</sup> Who seems to have held some diplomatic post at Paris, from which he had been recently recalled (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 104).

<sup>5</sup> I.e. the meeting of the new Parliament.

<sup>6</sup> He alludes to recent improvements.

<sup>7</sup> In his answer of August 3, (p. 116) Henry Savile makes a rather palpable hit. 'Your philosophical contemplation of not seeing Rufford makes my worship smile. When a lover is absent by his own choice it is a sign of a very moderate passion, and such has yours always been for Nottinghamshire.'

to Nottinghamshire, than the lamenting I cannot see it; I leave 1679  
you to the triumphs and diversions of your great wedding,<sup>1</sup> and  
to your particular enjoyments of Father Patrick,<sup>2</sup> and so kiss  
your hands.

By this time the new elections constituted the main and absorbing topic. 'And now,' as Burnet says, 'the hatred between the Earl of Shaftesbury' (and Lord Halifax) 'broke out into many violent and indecent instances. On Lord Shaftesbury's side more anger appeared, and more contempt on Lord Halifax's; and either strove to form an interest in the forthcoming Parliament. Halifax seems to have communicated with his cousin Thomas Thynne (in answer to a letter given above) begging that he would stand again. Mr. Thynne yielded to his solicitations. 'I have caused' (he adds) 'my cousin Finch to be chose at Litchfield, I the rather did it, knowing how entirely he is devoted to your Lordship; and tho' I know your actions will bear the test, yet since the World will make you the author of the Dissolution' of the Parliament, I thought it necessary your Friends should concern themselves to have good men chosen that the success might justify the Counsils to that end, I have not been idle one day since you wrote to me, and think I may tell you that in this Country' and Warwickshire which send 16, there will not be one unreasonable man, my endeavour is as much to keep out Lord Danby's friends, as fanaticks, and for that reason we shall exclude Mr. Levison. . . . Armstrong' will be of Strafford again, and I think Sir Charles Wolseley's brother, who assures me he will be true to the government. If you have any considerable friend you would oblige' (hopes to get him a seat); 'Little Sincerity' has all his Emissaries at worke to sound out y<sup>r</sup> praises; but he is noe stranger to you. I should say somewhat of y<sup>r</sup> Ips advancement, 'tis said you are to have a long traine of followers, w<sup>ch</sup> will make it more talkt of at the time, but y<sup>r</sup> Ip knows how truly I am yours, and consequently how much I rejoyce at any good happens to you.'

<sup>1</sup> Of Mademoiselle to the King of Spain.

<sup>2</sup> 'Though I have not the happiness of your friend Father Patrick's company, this town is lately made happy by his arrivall from Bruxelles' (H. Savile to Lord Halifax, July 12, *Savile Correspondence*, p. 109).

<sup>3</sup> July 26 (letter book, *Spencer MSS.*; and original (*ibid.*) 31 (51).

<sup>4</sup> Or 'disposition.'

<sup>5</sup> I.e. county. (See note 1, p. 175.)

<sup>6</sup> Favourite of Duke of Monmouth, executed after the 'Rye' Plot in 1684.

<sup>7</sup> A cant name for Shaftesbury, whose person was diminutive. It is used by James in his letters to Charles (*Life* by Clarke, i. 563).

1679 The answer of Lord Halifax runs as follows:—

*Viscount Halifax to Mr. Thomas Thynne.*<sup>1</sup>

(This  
for Thomas Thynne Esq at Drayton to bee left at Colshill  
Warwickshire)

July 31<sup>st</sup> 79.

Dear Cosen—Besides your kindnesse to mee in prevailing against your own inclinations at my request, which I must put amongst a thousand other obliging evidences you have given mee of your friendship, you are doing the most publique service that can bee to the Nation, by making use of your interest to get reasonable men chosen for the P<sup>th</sup> and if the rest of England had as good a prospect of elections as you have for 2 counties, I durst almost undertake, that notwithstanding all the discouraging circumstances wee live under, things might bee brought to such a settlement, as that wee might at least sleep secure from any sudden destruction. The world is at present a good deal heated, and I have iust interest enough at Court, to entitle mee to a part of the fury of the Coffee houses; I need not tell you that they are incouraged by some of my small friends,<sup>2</sup> which I need not describe to you; my method shall bee to let the storme have its course, and when wee grow calme againe, I do not doubt but I shall bee able to wipe of the dirt that hath been throwne upon mee; S<sup>r</sup> W. Coventry will not bee perswaded to stand<sup>3</sup> which I am sorry for, but you know hee is not easily to bee mooved. S<sup>r</sup> Wm Hickman goeth down next week, and I thinke without extraordinary industry hee cannot bee put by at Retford,<sup>4</sup> If hee should, you could not have a better man to fill one of the places at Turnworth. The King is gone to the Downs and said hee would go no further, but how farre his kindnesse to the sea may tempt him to stay out longer than hee intended, I cannot determine

I am, my dearest cosens

most faithfull humble servant

HALIFAX

Of almost equal interest is the letter in which Sir John Reresby seeks a new patron,<sup>5</sup> and renews relations with the statesman from whom, since he had forsaken the Country party for Danby, he had become necessarily alienated. He begins by informing his Lordship that he

<sup>1</sup> *Longleat MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> Shaftesbury.

<sup>3</sup> A letter of Sir William's (July 19) mentions the very indifferent state of his health (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>4</sup> He was re-elected 'quietly' (letter to Lord Halifax in the Spencer collection 31 [36], August 30).

<sup>5</sup> August 15, Reresby's note book, *Bodleian MSS.*, Rawlinson D. 204, f. 74b, described in margin as 'To ye Earle of Halifax after his being made of the privy Councel created an Earle, and retaken into ye K<sup>ts</sup> favour upon my L<sup>d</sup> of Danby's Imprisonment.'

thinks of standing for Parliament, and has taken some steps, but is at a stay 679

. . . till I have your Lordship's allowance ; haveing experienced ye difference between y<sup>r</sup> Lordship's assistance, and Neutrality when thos causes come to be tryed before ye Committee of priveleges,<sup>1</sup> I confess my Lord I have been very modest in makeing applications wher I feared they might be misconstrued . . . But I shall not suffer in your Lordships opinion I hope, when I assure your Lordssp that I was noe confident to that great Lord<sup>2</sup> of thos ills sopposed to be contrived against you on y<sup>e</sup> one hand, noe more then I was privy to that advantage, w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>u</sup> then only intended but w<sup>ch</sup> you will now certainly effect to ye Government by your wise and disinterested Councils on ye Other.

My Lord I must confess myselfe a true servant to y<sup>e</sup> Governmt and if I did any ways err in the Method of that Service, at a time when your Lordsp was not concerned but was only pleased to look on, I know not how better to convince your Lordssp of that reall respect I have for y<sup>r</sup> Lordsp, and off ye deferrence I have ever had for your Judgement, then to offer my self yet to persue y<sup>e</sup> same good ends by your Lordships advice, w<sup>ch</sup> I shall ever observe and perform as being

My L<sup>d</sup> y<sup>r</sup> faithfull Servant,

J. R.

I congratulate y<sup>r</sup> Lordssps late promotion to y<sup>t</sup> additionall Honour.

Henry Savile meanwhile, when complimenting his brother,<sup>3</sup> declined, in the absence of data, to discuss the dissolution. 'The step you have made,' he says,<sup>4</sup> 'in your house I do congratulate, provided the dissol. of parl<sup>t</sup> do not make the time a little improper for his Ma<sup>ty</sup>s favour to appear to his privy councillours.' He regrets that the second title is Eland rather than Savile ; 'I cannot conceive how either the sound or the antiquity of that name can please you better than your own.' The original line, moreover, had come to an unfortunate 'not to be so foppish' as to say 'a 'sinful' end ; and Halifax may well be thankful, so his brother insinuates, that he escapes the dread liabilities of the third and fourth

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the Committee for Elections, usually known, in allusion to its transparent partiality, as the 'Committee of Affections' :

<sup>2</sup> My lord Viscount Halifax being now of the council, and entering into business, though a great enemy to the Earl of Danby, professed a kindness to me and said he would befriend me as to my election no man having more interest with the Commons than he had ; but whether it was fear to disoblige his party, I found he was not very warm in the matter' (Heresby's *Memoirs* [1875], April 26, p. 168).

<sup>3</sup> The Earl of Danby.

<sup>4</sup> July 2<sup>d</sup>  
August 2<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 113.

<sup>6</sup> *Affectedly* moral, i.e. priggish.

1679 generations. Savile proceeds to hint that responsibility for the dissolution is generally ascribed to his brother, and playfully warns him that he will become exceedingly unpopular with all holders of seats, while his increased favour at Court has enhanced the necessity for Parliamentary credit. He concludes with compliments to 'the Countess of Halifax, my Lord Eland, my Lady Anne Savile, and not forgetting my little Lady Betty.'

His brother answered as follows :-

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*

Windsor, August <sup>11th</sup> 21st, '79.

I find by yours<sup>2</sup> that the late dissolution hath given some of us fame abroad as well as at home. It is some kind of preferment to be rail'd at, and I do not know whether I shall ever get any further ; in the mean time I have argued myself into so much philosophy upon this occasion, that I am neither disquieted nor alarm'd by it. You quarrel at my son's title, but when you consider that the advantage if any of my new promotion is only to him, and that in respect of some young woman with a good portion may perhaps by mistake think the better of him, it may be an argument that he is call'd by his title and not by his name, to take away the possibility of his ladies being thought a knight's wife, an objection I have often heard amongst the women, and so I let it prevail with me. I approve the continuance of your zeal<sup>3</sup> to vindicate our proceedings in the plot against the scandals that are thrown upon them ; and if you will needs publish some counter-poison to the infamous reports that are made of us, I cannot think of a shorter way than the translating into French a very good pamphlet lately come out as an answer to those very speeches you mention, which were made by the Jesuits at their execution. I will talk with somebody about it ; but I, being your younger brother in zeal, may perhaps not be so quick in it as to satisfy your impatience, and therefore I would not discourage you from what other ways you think fit to take to keep up the credit of our religion. My Lady Winchester sayeth that the plate she recommendeth to your care<sup>4</sup> will be brought to you, so that you do not want any more particular directions. I think you are well dealt with in being advised by your friends in the Treasury to lay out for the present occasion,<sup>1</sup> and then send in your bills, in which I advise you to be moderate, not only for conscience' sake, but also in prudence, because it will give you credit with them, and justifie their kindness to you, which it concerneth you extremely to preserve, there being so many occasions for you to make use of it. The Treasury is to be adjourn'd till near Michaelmas ; but my Lord of Essex telleth me he hopeth some money may be provided for

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter lxxxix., p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> Of <sup>July 21</sup> Aug 2 quoted above.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The Spanish match.

you before they meet again for this particular occasion. I am 1679  
 pleased to see your earnestness for a fair lady,<sup>1</sup> though it is not  
 necessary to me, who do already think it would be a sin not to  
 be partial to her in the dispute with her husband; and yet I  
 have not that reason for which you and my L<sup>d</sup> Newport are to  
 be suspected and envied. S<sup>r</sup> W. Coventry will not be per-  
 swaded to stand for this parlt<sup>nt</sup>, making use of his ill health  
 for an excuse. Your friend my L<sup>d</sup> Daincourt will try at  
 Newark, but sayeth he will not be at any charge, which maketh  
 me doubt his success; for I doubt your noble friends there will  
 not much approve a dry election, as a thing of ill example, and  
 tending to introduce presbytery, by the way of small beer,  
 besides the detriment it may bring to his Mat<sup>ty</sup> revenue of  
 excise.<sup>2</sup> My L<sup>d</sup> Lovelace bestirs himself in these parts upon  
 the election days, having several brought under his care, and  
 is extraordinary painfull<sup>3</sup> in his calling. Algernon Sydney is  
 chosen at Amersham;<sup>4</sup> but I hear there is a double return,  
 which will create more dispute.<sup>5</sup> This is a very different scene  
 from your preparations at Paris for the great wedding, which  
 maketh you all there play the fool in another kind, I must not  
 say a worse, because of my known quarrel to fine cloaths,  
 which maketh me a party, and then I must not be a judge.  
 The Duke hath desired my Lady Anne<sup>6</sup> may go over to him<sup>7</sup>  
 for a month or two, and I hear the King complyeth with it.  
 I have nothing more to tell you, so that the kindest thing is to  
 make an end. Yours.

We must now in due course revert to the progress of  
 the negotiation with the States. Henry Sidney had  
 been some ten days in Holland when he first wrote to  
 Lord Halifax on the subject of his mission.

*Henry Sidney to the Earl of Halifax.*<sup>8</sup>

Hague, August ye 2<sup>o</sup>.

My Lord If I could tell you all the particulars of my  
 negociation I am sure you would be very well satisfied, for you

<sup>1</sup> This refers to a mysterious appeal in Savile's letter of August 2<sup>o</sup>, on  
 behalf of a lady 'whose merit will sufficiently speak for herself, since you  
 were in danger of a duell for her but a year ago;' and who 'has to do with  
 such a hound' (of a husband, apparently) that she 'cannot possibly be in  
 the wrong,' &c. (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 116).

<sup>2</sup> Jestling allusions to Henry's own experience of Newark elections.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. painstaking.

<sup>4</sup> Agmondesham.

<sup>5</sup> There was a double return, and after much petitioning and counter-  
 petitioning, the question remained open at the dissolution. (See original  
 note, *Savile Correspondence*, p. 118.)

<sup>6</sup> Princess Anne, afterwards Queen.

<sup>7</sup> The Duke of York was still at Brussels.

<sup>8</sup> This letter has been printed by Blencowe (from a copy) with Sidney's  
*Diary*. We give it from the original, in the *Spencer MSS.* 31 (2f), which  
 differs slightly from the copy.

1679 could not expect anything better (I doe not mean you may innagine on my own part) and that you will know by the first good opportunity. I made some proposalls<sup>1</sup> last post from the Prince of Orange and Mon<sup>r</sup> Van Beuningham<sup>2</sup> which I hope you will approve of. it is thought here the onely meanes of saving Europe, and those great men of Amsterdam that have been ever thought of the French faction are well pleased with this, and doe say sometimes to some of their friends, that rather than be used as they were at *Bodegrave*,<sup>3</sup> they would chuse to submitt themselves quietly to France, but if there be an appearance of their being able to make any defence, which they beleeve they may doe with the assistance of England and Spain they will use their uttermost endeavours to preserve their liberties. The Prince having brought the States to this resolution is thought to have more power and credit than ever he had, I am sure he deserves it, for he hath abundance of good Qualities, it will be a fortnight before he comes to towne, and till then he will spend most of his time a hunting and thinke little of Businesse, but ever of his freinds, Mons<sup>r</sup> Van Beuningham calls you one of his, and desires me to make a compliment to you for him; all I can say for myself is but what you know already that no man loves you better, and is more your servant then

II. SIDNEY.

*The same to the same.*<sup>4</sup>

Hague August ye 8<sup>th</sup>.

My Lord Just now I received a letter from the Prince, which he desires me to send to you, and I am glad enough of an occasion of bringing my self into your thoughts, for I flatter my self with the hopes that when I am there, tis with kindnesse, I am sure you can not thinke of [a] better friend, nor of one that will studdy more to deserve your good opinion; since the last post there hath hapned nothing worth informing you of, I had my Audience yesterday, and afterwards invited some of the States to dinner, made them almost drunke and my owne head ach (etc.)

<sup>1</sup> These proposals were differently understood (a) by Temple, (b) by Sunderland and Halifax. (a) Temple understood Van Beuning to desire a *defensive* league between *England, Spain, and Holland*. (b) Sunderland and Halifax suppose him to mean an *Anglo-Spanish defensive league*, for the protection of Flanders, complementary to the existing Hispano-Dutch understanding. (c) England having no desire to engage in the interminable formalities of Spanish diplomacy, her Government pressed a *league of guarantee between England and Holland* alone (Temple and Sunderland, letters of August 29, in Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 104-114; *Dutch Despatches*, June 1679, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. SSS, f. 260).

<sup>2</sup> *Van Beuning* of Amsterdam (see *ante*, chap. iv.); he had been Dutch representative in England, and had just returned. Burnet (edit. 1833, vol. i. p. 604) gives his character.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. in 1672. (See *ante*.) These words are not in the printed copy.

<sup>4</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (21).

*The Earl of Halifax to Mr. Sidney.*<sup>1</sup>

London, August 18, '79.

I am to thank you for two of yours, the last of which was 1679 delivered first to me. I will say little to the kind part of either of them, my good opinion of you having been so long fixed, and being every day increased by your repeated marks of friendship, that all I can say of it is, that it is at its full growth, and I could wish no more for the good of the world than that the public friendships were as well established where we would place them. You will have it from better hands than the project you mention is not approved of here; and, presuming you will be told the reasons at the same time, I do believe you will acquiesce in them. Other men may propose to themselves other hopes, but mine are all restrained to the person and character of the Prince, whose interest with the States and influence upon the country is that which must keep things firm and steady, and, without that, I look upon every thing there as floating and changeable, and their government would be as unsafe to build an alliance, as most of their ground is to build a house upon.<sup>2</sup> But from the good sense and vigour of the Prince I hope every thing; and pray, as the best and kindest office you can do me, endeavour to represent me as I am towards him, and you shall not run any hazard of forfeiting your credit with him by engaging for me. You will remember to say something for me to Monsieur Van Beuninghen: thus you see how little scruple I make to trouble you with my small commissions.

I go to Windsor to-morrow for some days, being forced to live between both, neither here nor there, which is not so pleasant a method as that I should make it my choice; but it must be submitted to. When the elections are all made, we shall be able to give some judgment of the complexion of the Parliament, and so give a near guess what we are to hope and fear from their meeting.

We dined the other day at Sheen,<sup>3</sup> where you were remembered, as you shall ever be, with particular kindness, by

Your most faithful, humble servant,

HALIFAX.

The meetings of the Council<sup>4</sup> had been adjourned

<sup>1</sup> Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 88.

<sup>2</sup> 'The designs & the interests' (of the two parties in Holland) 'were very different, & to put it better, entirely opposed. The Republicans wished to preserve the peace, & to remain attached to France. The Prince of Orange wished to unite the States to England, & endeavoured to create a confederation strong enough to make head against France, & support a war, if he could bring matters to that pass' (d'Avaux, *Negotiations* i. 12, [1679], edit. Mallet).

<sup>3</sup> Sir William Temple's.

<sup>4</sup> The Committee (British Museum Add. MSS. 15.643, ff. 10-14), on the



1679 from August 7,<sup>1</sup> and it was arranged that they should not be resumed until after Michaelmas. Shaftesbury, who felt himself practically superseded, probably consoled himself at St. Giles; Sir William Temple certainly retired to Sheen.<sup>2</sup> 'I recommended,' he says, 'the common cares to the three lords; whose attendance, I knew, would not fail at court, two from their offices, and the third' (Halifax) 'from his humour; which he owned always must have business to employ it, or would else be uneasy.'<sup>3</sup>

All three were accordingly at Windsor when, on August 22, Charles, whose health for some eight years had been uniformly good, fell suddenly ill.<sup>4</sup>

During two or three days the general consternation defies description; wild rumours of poison prevailed in the city,<sup>5</sup> and panic terror reigned supreme. In the uncertain state of public affairs people, as Temple observes, looked upon 'any thing, at this time, that should happen ill to the king as an end of the world.' The legal successor was abroad, and the prospect of his succession, while it aroused on every hand grave misgivings, excited among the thwarted exclusionists a fanatical repugnance which seemed to threaten a civil war.<sup>6</sup> The Duke of Monmouth meanwhile at this alarming crisis had reached the zenith of his career. His military reputation stood at its height, and the entire standing force of the two kingdoms was at his disposal.<sup>7</sup> The Scottish Moderates, and even the Presbyterians whom he had overthrown, regarded him with a grateful devotion. The populace of England, captivated by his personal charm and by the romantic legend of his birth and his wrongs, traced in his wild youth and martial prowess a half-superstitious resemblance to 'Harry of Monmouth,' first among national heroes. Politically, the support of Shaftesbury, the most daring of contemporary statesmen, was certainly

other hand, had met June 21, 28, and 29; July 16; August 3 and 7 (Halifax being present each time); also August 27, after which (probably on account of the King's illness) the meetings were not resumed till September 18.

<sup>1</sup> Sunderland to Sidney (Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 110).

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*.

<sup>3</sup> *Works* (1770), ii. 513.

<sup>4</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Open)*, August 22, September 1 (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EL, f. 211). See also *Halton Correspondence* (i. 189-192), and a volume of *Letters . . . to Francis Parry* (1817).

<sup>5</sup> As a matter of fact he had caught a chill on the 20th by staying out too late hawking, after having overheated himself at tennis, and felt indisposed the following day.

<sup>6</sup> See Russell's saying (*Deronsshire House Notebook*).

<sup>7</sup> In addition to the supreme command, he held the government of Hull and the Lieutenancies of Staffordshire and of the East Riding.

at the Duke of Monmouth's command; and with it 1679 perhaps, at such a juncture, the support of many less extreme.

How far his designs might extend, whether in the event of a revolution the young general would declare for his own hand<sup>1</sup> or for a Republic, no one professed to foresee; but there were some who had resolved that the question should never, if their exertions could prevail, require a solution. Lords Essex and Halifax (for the adroit Sunderland had personal relations with Lord Shaftesbury) were convinced that the triumph of the President and of Monmouth must involve, with national disaster, irrevocable ruin for themselves. The 'Triumvirate' met in hurried and secret conclave. The young Duke (who, though detained in London by the military exigences of the situation, paid frequent visits to Windsor) had, so they discovered, urged his father to forbid, in express terms, the Duke of York's return. The inference appeared conclusive, and the friends resolved upon action.<sup>2</sup> Their decision had the Royal endorsement, and, probably upon the 24th or 25th, Sunderland despatched an express to Brussels<sup>3</sup> commanding James 'to repair at once with all secrecy to Windsor.' He was specifically warned that the journey must appear to be spontaneous.<sup>4</sup> The secret was well kept, and even Temple, who about the 28th went down to Windsor for enquiries, heard nothing of the impending visit.<sup>5</sup> Charles by that time was on the road to convalescence, and the conspirators, somewhat ashamed perhaps of their precipitance, and not a little alarmed as to the consequences of their daring expedient, were by no means inclined to garrulity. Their position was, in fact, one of extreme embarrassment. The political gulf which yawned between them and the Duke of York was

<sup>1</sup> D'Avaux maintains that Monmouth, in a *private* conversation with Orange some weeks later, mentioned the reports concerning his supposed pretensions at the time of his father's illness, and added 'qu'il n'étoit pas assez fou pour avoir de pareilles visions.' Such a disclaimer has, of course, no weight, nor can we attach any credit to d'Avaux's report of an interview which, he confesses, was purely *personal* (*Négociations*, i. 61).

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of James*, in Macpherson's *Original Papers*, i. 98. The *Life* erroneously ascribes this policy to the King.

<sup>3</sup> Only the King, the Duchess of Portsmouth, and a few of the Duke's more intimate friends were privy to the fact.

<sup>4</sup> In the King's name.

<sup>5</sup> He had already received an official notice of the seizure.

<sup>6</sup> Henry Sidney afterwards asked the Secretary and Halifax why they had recalled the Duke, who would certainly have else returned on his own initiative, and spared them all responsibility (*Diary*, June 15, 1680, ii. 75).

<sup>7</sup> Letter to Henry Sidney, August 29 (Blencowe, i. 101).

1679 a wide one—far wider indeed, if we except the ‘one point of the succession, than that which now severed them from Lord Shaftesbury and his followers. Both Moderates and Exclusionists maintained in their entirety the traditions of the Country party, while to the Duke of York that party with all its works was anathema. The Moderates he regarded with a disfavour scarcely inferior to that which he bestowed on the extremists; and he believed indeed (not without some reason) that while they ‘had gain’d this credit with the King by appearing against the Exclusion . . . in the bottom they desired the same thing another way.’<sup>1</sup> To the policy pursued during the four preceding months—to the repressive measures against Popery, to the negotiations with Holland, to the attack on Lauderdale—he was diametrically and conscientiously opposed. His personal hostility to Halifax had not declined,<sup>2</sup> and he had with difficulty compelled himself to formulate a civil message.<sup>3</sup>

At this critical instant Lord Halifax wrote as follows to his brother :—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>4</sup>

Windsor August 28th  
September 7th 1719.

I had yours<sup>5</sup> yesterday, and before I answer any part of it I must for my own vindication tell you I had sent you an early notice of the King's being ill if some of your kind friends had not assured me they would do it, by which I was secure that you would not be left in ignorance by my omitting it. The first begining of his sickness gave us some fears, his continued health making it appear a very new thing to us as well as to him; and then the consequence at such a critical time did so strike men that they were not left at liberty to judge of it with indifference; but now that he is better, and men's thoughts are a little more quieted, we are in better humour, and if we may believe either the doctors or all other appearances and symptoms there is no cause left to apprehend any danger. The doctors have yesterday given him a remedy<sup>6</sup> which they say will prevent any more fits coming upon him. As to your own business it happen'd well that all your friends in the Treasury

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, i. 556 and 558 9.

<sup>2</sup> York to Dartmouth, July 22 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 36): ‘I am very glad you spake to him’ (the King) [as] ‘you did about Lords Halifax, Essex, and Sunderland, I have long looked on the two first as men that did not love a monarchy as it was in England.’ *I once told the first I looked on him as one of the dangerest men I knew* which was all the harsh words I remember I ever said to him.’

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter xc., p. 119.

<sup>5</sup> Not extant.

<sup>6</sup> The ‘Jesuit's powder,’ or quinine.

were present when I received your letter, which I imparted to them; and I find them so kindly disposed towards you that they think it reasonable to go beyond your own proposal, and I believe they will pitch upon 500*l.* to be the sum in gross, without giving you the trouble of sending your taylor's bills. This is somewhat more than 1,500 crowns, and they meet in a few days to do some business, at which time your friend Mr. Guy<sup>1</sup> will produce your letter to them, which I left with him for that purpose, and did recommend to his care to get everything done as to the manner of your payment so as it may be the most advantageous for you; and I think I cannot comitt it to better hands. I can easily acquitt you from the guilt of loving fine cloaths for their own sake; it is a crime our family hath very little to answer for, but you must be fine in your publick capacity;<sup>2</sup> and for our credit you must give an advantageous pattern of our wealth by the richness of your embroidery; and of our wit by the choice of your ribbons. Heaven direct you and your taylor so that your poor country may not suffer by you! Adieu, yours.

The Duke of York meanwhile had received on the 28th his summons; he reached Windsor, *incognito*, at seven o'clock on the morning of September 2, and was the first to inform the King of his own arrival. Charles received him kindly and with pretended astonishment; and James, as he had been instructed, assumed, in an audible voice, entire responsibility for the step.<sup>3</sup> The courtiers crowded round, and bonfires were lit in his honour. The younger Duke was out hunting, and his surprise and annoyance at the unexpected advent of his uncle could not be disguised. Lord Halifax hereupon wrote as follows to his cousin Henry Frederick Thynne,<sup>4</sup> brother of Thomas:—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Frederick Thynne.*<sup>5</sup>

Windsor, Tuesday morning.

I receaved yours yesterday, which I shewed to my L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland, hee sayeth there is care taken to send an answer to my L<sup>d</sup> of Inchiquen's letter, though, I think his request to come over

<sup>1</sup> Groom of the Bedchamber and Secretary of the Treasury (see original note, *Savile Correspondence*).

<sup>2</sup> This still refers to the festivities at the contracting of Mademoiselle to the King of Spain.

<sup>3</sup> See also the account in the *Gazette*, quoted by Kennet (iii. 377); and *Dutch Despatches (Open)* of September 12 (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 217). This is very full.

<sup>4</sup> Grandfather of the second Lord Weymouth.

<sup>5</sup> This letter has been abstracted in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iv. 228. It is here given from the original, which is among the *Longleat MSS.*

1679 is refused, as being judged unseasonable at this time; two hours since, whilst we were at the Kgs rising, the Duke came in, very much to his surprise as well as ours. I wish M<sup>r</sup> Secretary, better health and am ever,

Your faithfull

humble servant "

HALIFAX.

Pray write this piece of newes to S<sup>r</sup> William.

Meanwhile Temple, who was in London, received the same morning intelligence of the Duke's return. Ignorant of the part which Lords Halifax and Essex had played, he sympathised with their probable dismay, and determined to employ on their behalf all his own influence with the Duke. Thus benignly disposed, he called upon Lord Essex, whom he found starting for Windsor in a state of apparent agitation.<sup>1</sup> 'Next day,' records Temple, 'I went to Windsor, and the first man I met was lord Halifax coming down from court on foot, and with a face full of trouble; and as soon as he saw me, with hands lift up two or three times; upon which I stopt, and, alighting, asked what was the matter; he told me, I knew all as well as he; that the duke was come; that every body was amazed; but where we were, or what would be next, no body knew: he bid me go on to court before the king went out; said he was going to his lodging, to sit and think over this new world; but desired we might meet, and my lord Sunderland, after dinner.'

The vexation and bewilderment which Temple, in the bitterness of a subsequent initiation, dismissed as artificial, were probably real to the last degree. The 'Triumvirate' stood exactly in the position of a conjuror who has raised a devil he knows not how to lay. The necessity for the Duke's presence had passed; and the 'Triumvirate,' which fully returned his political antipathy,<sup>2</sup> hastened with uncompromising frankness to explain the situation.<sup>3</sup> Within thirty-six hours of his return the three Ministers<sup>4</sup> waited upon the Duke. Sunderland took

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs (Works [1770], ii. 515).*

<sup>2</sup> We allude, of course, mainly to Lords Halifax and Essex; Sunderland acted with his usual duplicity. (See for this, Temple's *Memoirs*; James, in Macpherson's *Original Papers*, i. 91, 95.) He persuaded Monmouth of his sympathy while valuing himself with the Duke of York on his share in the recall.

<sup>3</sup> Temple's statement that Halifax and Essex acted with the Duke's party for some weeks after his return is *certainly* erroneous.

<sup>4</sup> September 3 (*Life of James*, i. 567). They were accompanied by two of the Duke's friends (Hyde and Godolphin of the Treasury) who had been cognisant of the summons.

the initiative,<sup>1</sup> and pointing out that while the recovery of the King rendered the Duke's departure possible, the nearness of the session made it eminently advisable, he offered, in the name of his colleagues, to obtain from the King, as a counterpoise, the expatriation of the Duke of Monmouth. The last proposition has a touch of genius. It united the somewhat incompatible interests of the Duke of York on the one hand with those of the Ministers and of the country on the other. The consent of Charles having been elicited,<sup>2</sup> the compromise became effective; and about the 10th the Duke of Monmouth, to his astonishment and disgust, found himself required to resign his commission as Captain-General and to leave the country for an indefinite period.

The 'Triumvirate' had thus scored a decided success against both their political adversaries; but brief indeed was their triumph. Scarcely had they breathed again, ere the Duke of York engaged in a very disingenuous intrigue for the rescinding of his own part in the compact.<sup>3</sup> Eventually the terms were modified. James received permission to remove with his family from Brussels to Scotland, an arrangement which had the ready acquiescence of Lord Essex, the underhand encouragement of Sunderland, and the reluctant consent of Lord Halifax.<sup>4</sup> Nor was this all. A treacherous understanding took shape between the Heir-Presumptive and Sunderland, according to which James, while ostensibly on his way to the North, should halt with his family in London, his stay being insensibly prolonged with a view to his permanent settlement. But, ignorant though Halifax remained of these discreditable dealings, his anxieties were sufficiently poignant, both from a personal and a political point of view. The Duke had evidently re-established an influence at Court; and this boded ill for the prosecution of the Moderate policy, to which Halifax during the preceding months had given his sanction and support. The ascendancy of the 'Triumvirate' seemed to have reached its term, and the position of Halifax and Essex appeared one of peculiar and hazardous isolation. Strained as were their relations with the Heir-Presumptive, their opposition to the principle of exclusion had, as we know, created an avowed breach between the two Earls and the

<sup>1</sup> Probably as the least obnoxious.

<sup>2</sup> September 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Life of James and Memoirs* (in Macpherson).

<sup>4</sup> Secretary Coventry, for once, asserted himself and warmly advocated the Duke of York's return.

1679 supporters of Lord Shaftesbury. The prorogation and dissolution had further impaired their popularity, and a suspicion as to their complicity in the recall of the Duke of York brought irritation to a climax.<sup>1</sup> Among a very large section of the Country party they were the objects of a jealous and increasing bitterness, which stigmatised them as little less than traitors to the common cause. 'I know not,' writes Algernon Sidney to Henry Savile,<sup>2</sup> 'how much your friends and mine do grow at Court, nor whether the gains they can expect to make there, will countervail what they lose in the Nation; but I do think myself assured, that two of them,<sup>3</sup> who were generally as well esteemed as any men I know, are now as ill spoken of as any; and the asperity one of them shewed against the Papists, is most bitterly retorted upon him.'<sup>4</sup>

Harassed by disappointment and apprehension, the health of Halifax began to suffer, and after the return of the Court to London, about the middle of September,<sup>5</sup> his

<sup>1</sup> The suspicion can be traced in a letter of September 6 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 6, p. 21): 'It is said that he was sent for by the advice of some of the Privy Counsellors, but the *Gazette* says he came unexpectedly.' It had taken a definite form as early as September 14. (See Henry Sidney's *Diary*, i. 137.)

<sup>2</sup> September 1, *Letters*, p. 145).

<sup>3</sup> Halifax and Essex.

<sup>4</sup> See also *Hatton Correspondence*, pp. 193, 197, September 8 and 25. 'My L<sup>d</sup> Halifax is become soe great a courtier as never is from ye Kinges elbow. Thus you see how men change their mindes upon occasions. . . . This is certain, y<sup>e</sup> E. of Halifax and Essex are quite lost in y<sup>e</sup> opinion of y<sup>e</sup> men of Shaftsbury.'

<sup>5</sup> The following letter from Lord Halifax to his cousin H. P. Thynne belongs to this period:—

*The Earl of Halifax to H. P. Thynne.*

'Windsor, friday afternoone.

'I acquainted the King with the contents of your letter, and hee sayeth there shall bee a Committee of Councell as soon as hee cometh to Town, which will bee the beginning of the next week; in the mean time he will speak to the Marquis of Bergeneym to perswade his priest to bee so wise as to give bayle. Mr Oates his desire to have him kept in custody maketh all the difficulty in the case; else between his Spanish and his Welsh capacity, there seemeth rather to be matter of arrest than any great occasion of icalousy.

'I am

'your affectionate humble servant,

'HALIFAX.'

(*Longleat MSS.*; abstract given in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iv. 228. The date is probably September 12, as the Court removed to London September 17 [o.s.]. See *Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 225.) This appears to refer to a matter mentioned in the *Dutch Despatches* (*Open*), October 3. Bourgemaine was the Spanish Ambassador, just then, on the point of recall in favour of Ronguillos. Mass had been said in his chapel in town, during his absence at Newmarket, and his priest had been arrested in consequence. Eventually the priest was released,

condition became more or less serious.<sup>1</sup> 'I saw plainly,' 1679  
 says Temple,<sup>2</sup> who visited him in the earlier days of his  
 illness, 'his distemper was not what he called it; his  
 head looked very full, but very unquiet; and when we were  
 left alone, all our talk was by snatches; sickness, ill  
 humour, hate of town and business, ridiculousness of  
 human life; and whenever I turned any thing to the pre-  
 sent affairs after our usual manner, nothing but action  
 of hands or eyes, wonder, and signs of trouble, and then  
 silence.'<sup>3</sup> 'Lord Halifax,' says Burnet, 'fell ill, much  
 from vexation of mind: his spirits were oppressed, a deep  
 melancholy seizing him: for a fortnight together I was  
 once a day with him, and found then that he had deep[er]<sup>4</sup>  
 impressions of religion on him [than those who knew the  
 rest of his life would have thought him capable of].  
 Some foolish people gave it out that he was mad: but I  
 never knew him so near a state of true wisdom as he was  
 at that time . . . he was offered to be made secretary  
 of state, but he refused it. Some gave it out that he pre-  
 tended to be lord lieutenant of Ireland, and was uneasy<sup>5</sup>  
 when that was denied him: but he said to me that it was  
 offered him, and he had refused it.<sup>6</sup> He did not love,  
 he said, a new scene, nor to dine with sound of trumpet  
 and thirty-six dishes of meat on his table. He likewise  
 and a complimentary letter despatched to the aggrieved Ambassador  
 (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 226).

<sup>1</sup> September 13, Sir William Hickman wrote to enquire (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [36].) Halifax was absent from the Committee on the 18th (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, f. 146).

<sup>2</sup> *Works* (1770), ii. 517.

<sup>3</sup> Temple eventually probed the mystery of the Duke's recall, and was furious at the want of confidence shown towards himself.

<sup>4</sup> The passages in brackets, suppressed in the first edition of the *History*, were subsequently restored. (See edit. 1833, ii. 242.)

<sup>5</sup> See the letter in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vi. part 2, p. 711, from a contemporary to the Duke of Ormonde, the reigning Lieutenant. Shaftesbury, who had been absent during this exciting interval, returned to town, probably about September 21 (Christie, ii. 348). Halifax sent to apologise for not waiting upon him, with the plea of illness. Shaftesbury retorted, 'he mistooke his disease, that it was *Ormond* lay very heavy across his stomach, and he could neither get it up or down.'

<sup>6</sup> This is asserted by a contemporary (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vi. part 2, p. 741). It was probably about this time that there appeared the notorious

'Essay upon Satire,' now ascribed to Sheffield, Lord Musgrave, for which, on December 18, 1679, at the instance of Lord Rochester, of whom it contains a severe portrait, Dryden, the reputed author, was cudgelled. (See W. D. Christie's introduction to the *Poems of Dryden*, Clarendon Press Series, p. xxx; and Seward, *Anecdotes*, ii. 230.) The lampoon, though exceedingly coarse, is not wanting in vigour. The author disclaims all intention of satirising those who are beneath contempt:

' . . . Satire nicely writ, with humour stings  
 But those who merit praise in other things.'



1679 saw that lord Essex had a mind to be again there; and he was confident he was better fitted for it than he himself was. My being much with him at that time,' says Burnet, 'was reflected on: It was said, I had heightened his disaffection to the court:' (especially by Hyde) 'I was with him only as a divine.'

Meanwhile the Dutch Treaty remained in suspense.

*Mr. Sidney to the Earl of Halifax.*<sup>1</sup>

Sept. 7.

I can not tell you anything from hence but that our world here is in strange expectation to know what kind of scene you have in England this last weeke; no body will doe any businesse little or great with an Englishman till they know certainly the condition of the King's health, and what reception the Duke hath had: there is no man in the Countrey that is not guessing, and no two that are of a mind. The Prince is now att Hounslerdike, but he comes hither every morning to the Assembly of the States, I show'd him part of your letter,<sup>2</sup> and upon it had a good deale of discourse with him of you, which you may easily

We are introduced in turn to Buckingham ('The merriest man alive'), Shaftesbury ('our little Machiavel'), and a third character ('the new Earl') who has been usually identified with Lord Essex. But Lord Essex had received his earldom eighteen years before, and the passage appears to us an obvious shaft at Lord Halifax, whose likeness follows, with peculiar propriety, upon that of Lord Shaftesbury. The reader may judge from the lines in question:—

[Next our] new earl with parts deserving praise,  
And wit enough to laugh at his own ways;  
Yet loses all soft days and sensual nights,  
Kind nature checks and kinder fortune slights;  
Striving against his quiet all he can,  
For the fine notion of a busy man.  
And what is that at best, but one, whose mind  
Is made to tire himself and all mankind?  
For Ireland he would go; faith, let him reign;  
For if some odd fantastic lord would fain  
Carry in trunks, and all my drudgery do,  
I'll not only pay him, but admire him too.  
But is there any other beast that lives,  
Who his own harm so wittingly contrives?

Yet this fond man, to get a statesman's name,  
Forfeits his friends, his freedom, and his fame.

We have given the current version printed in Moxon's edition of Dryden (1851), p. 43. It is probably corrupt enough, since the poem originally circulated in manuscript; but the satire, as printed in Buckinghamshire's *Works* (1723), vol. i. pp. 113–126 (from which we take the first two words of our quotation), has been obviously rewritten, and has therefore no historical interest. It is there erroneously ascribed to the year 1675.

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (21).

<sup>2</sup> Not extant.

imagine was not to your disadvantage, he hath desired me to say a great deale for him to you, which I will be sure to doe one of these days, and in everything I can show you how well I love you, and how ready I will be to doe you any service, for no body can be more then I am (&c.) 1679

Lord Halifax answered as follows, in somewhat oracular fashion :—

*The Earl of Halifax to Mr. Sidney.*<sup>1</sup>

London, September 19th, '79.

I have been indisposed and am so still, which, though it be some excuse for me that I have been so slow in answering your last, yet it must not keep me any longer from doing that which I have always so much mind to do. I do not wonder that what hath happened here lately set everybodys thoughts at work where you are; and no doubt till these riddles are cleared, we must expect nobody will be in temper to take any measures with us. But my Lord of Sunderland hath from time to time acquainted you with the state of our world, and by that enabled you to lessen if not destroy the fears that have been raised in Holland upon the late occasions, and when the things are executed, which are intended, I hope the conclusion of these matters will give as much satisfaction as the beginning of them afforded occasion for jealousy and dispute. You cannot give me a greater mark of your kindness than your continuing to do me good offices where I am so ambitious to be well, and I do not doubt you will get so good an interest there yourself, as that, besides your own satisfaction, it will be an advantage and a furtherance to those things that are designed.

• It is no small mark of the Prince's credit that he hath been able to draw Monsieur Van Beuningen from his opinion, to which he is naturally partial enough, if I do not mistake him; therefore, if our disagreements here, when the Parliament meeteth, do not prove to be such as will discourage all our friends abroad from dealing with us, I am in hopes we may join in the means for our preservation, notwithstanding the arts as well [as] the power of France,<sup>2</sup> which are both great arguments to discompose any model that can be made against them. We say here that the Duke of Monmouth will go next week, and the Duke a day after him.<sup>3</sup> The King seemeth inclined to go to Newmarket; his inclination is so strong for it, that it is an ill way of making one's court to dissuade him from it, though

<sup>1</sup> Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 145.

<sup>2</sup> France was endeavouring to effect a counter-alliance with the States (*Négociations of d'Avaux*, ed. Mallet, i. 20).

<sup>3</sup> The Duke of York made this arrangement deliberately as a mark of his own superiority (*Dutch Despatches*).

1679 most wish he would stay in town for more reasons<sup>1</sup> besides his health.<sup>2</sup>

I am ever your most faithful Servant,  
HALIFAX.

In effect, the Duke of Monmouth left England<sup>3</sup> for Holland, September 24. His uncle started for Brussels on the following day; and notwithstanding the futile anger of Shaftesbury and his followers,<sup>4</sup> the impending visit to Scotland was notified in the 'Gazette' of October 7.<sup>5</sup> Parliament had been deferred from October 17 till October 30; but on October 13, to the general surprise and to the utter consternation of Halifax and Essex, the yacht which had been despatched for the Duke of York and his family arrived in the river with its distinguished passengers, who, as prearranged with Lord Sunderland, proceeded to land. The Duke's intentions were eagerly canvassed by the astonished world, and the extent of his recovered authority soon appeared. Two days later Lord Shaftesbury was dismissed the Council.

This blow, no doubt, the Moderates could endure with equanimity; but a second shaft from the ducal quiver left them aghast. Charles, with the same breath and evidently upon the same instigation, announced his intention of postponing the expected session (the subject of such anxious solitudes) by short prorogations *for a whole year*. 'All at council,' says Temple, 'were stunned at this surprising resolution,' and Sir William himself was exasperated into a public and spirited though ineffectual remonstrance.<sup>6</sup> Halifax, who appears to have been still confined to his house,<sup>7</sup> was not present; but having received a special intimation of the King's design, he had 'expostulated severely upon it with some that were sent to him from the king.'<sup>8</sup> Two days later<sup>9</sup> the first prorogation to January was officially promulgated.

<sup>1</sup> Namely, because they thought he ought to be at Whitehall some time before the meeting of Parliament (*Dutch Despatches* [*Open*], September 7, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. EE, f. 219b).

<sup>2</sup> Which argument was used by the physicians (*ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> Christie, ii. 348. Shaftesbury called a meeting of his supporters in the Privy Council, October 5; no decision was reached.

<sup>4</sup> Kennet, iii. 377.

<sup>5</sup> Temple, ii. 522, and *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 211. This letter appears to be undated; we presume it should be October 18.

<sup>6</sup> There is an apparent conflict between *Hatton Correspondence* (i. 212) and Burnet. The former says Halifax was present, and spoke against the proposal. He was absent from the meetings of the Committee on the 19th and 26th (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, ff. 15, 16).

<sup>7</sup> Burnet, edit. 1833, ii. 242.

<sup>8</sup> " October 17.

The mortification of Halifax and Essex may be imagined. They roused themselves to a final remonstrance, and procured an order from Charles requiring his brother's immediate departure for Scotland.<sup>1</sup> Before he left<sup>2</sup> the country, however, the relations between the Duke and the Ministers were still further exasperated by the countenance which the Duke had extended to an informer who had accused Halifax and Essex of participation in a forged 'Protestant Plot.'<sup>3</sup>

Meanwhile Henry Savile was complaining bitterly,<sup>4</sup> though in his usual witty vein, of the 'stupid ignorance' in which he had been left. He had heard from a casual source alone of the illness from which his brother was recovering; as regards political affairs, he lived in absolute darkness; nor could he assist his friends against the most obvious calumnies. *From Sunderland the envoy had received but two letters* since the commencement of his embassy. 'I am fain,' he says, 'to nibble in my discourses of England like the asse mumbling thistles.' The recent crisis<sup>5</sup> had found him without a clue; 'Being tyed to those interests that inclination as well as nature direct me to follow. . . . I knew not from those I intend to shewte with whether I was to cry a Y[ork] or a M[onmouth].'

Nor did his expostulations evoke an entirely luminous answer.

<sup>1</sup> October 20.

<sup>2</sup> October 27.

<sup>3</sup> The forgery was sufficiently clumsy; but the friends of the Popish Lords, who hoped that the revelations might serve as a counterblast to the Popish plot, innocently abetted the scheme by the confidence they placed in certain mercenary and unscrupulous intriguers. It was through James, on his return from Brussels, that Willoughby, or Dangerfield, the principal informer, communicated with the King; and it was believed that James had given him a trifling present. Dangerfield appeared before the Council, October 23 and 24; on the 26th the Duke of York explained in Committee the application to himself. To persons of any discernment or knowledge of parties as they existed, a story which involved Halifax and Essex, with Shaftesbury, Radnor, Buckingham, Wharton, &c., as advisers, in the scheme of a Presbyterian or Republican rebellion, projected during the late illness of the King, bore its refutation on its face. The forgers, who were as ignorant as they were unscrupulous, had simply selected the most Protestant names for their purpose. Dangerfield was committed for perjury, October 27; and on the 29th the whole plot was unravelled by means of papers found in the 'Meal-tub' of an accomplice; hence the received nickname of the plot. Halifax and Essex considered that they had been pointedly excluded from the consultations relative to the affair; but the absence of Halifax from the Committee was due to his illness. (See Rapin, North, Burnet, Dangerfield; and British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643.)

<sup>4</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, October 15, pp. 122, 123.

<sup>5</sup> The almost panic terror with which the King's danger inspired him is curiously illustrated by his letter to H. Sidney, printed in Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 140, 141. •

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*London <sup>Octbr 30th,</sup> Nov<sup>r</sup> 9th, '79.

1679

I was not till now well enough to write to you ; but those that had inform'd you of my being recover'd were a little too hasty, for I am but now creeping out of a distemper that hath afflicted me cruelly ; and I have the same contemplation upon it as you have, that things of this kind are apt to grow upon us with our age, which maketh me desirous to take the more time for my cure, in hope to alter the habit of my blood, and take away that sharpness which it hath ever been subject to. It is not strange to me that censures are thrown at random upon men who are thought to be in business, and they must be content to receive the shot, and yet are bound up by their circumstances from making their defence. You may answer to y<sup>r</sup> self and every body else that I will always mean well, and though I may committ errors they will be such as have no guilt in them, if a man can be justified by good intentions. It is not easy to acquaint you with the details of some things at this distance, though my Lord Sunderland hath always told me he took care you should know everything that was done, as far as it was communicable ; and, though I find by yours his correspondence with you is not very quick, yet I desire you will not complain of it, not so much as within y<sup>r</sup> self ; both in respect of my L<sup>d</sup> nature, that is apt to neglect forms ; and, which is a better reason, because he is so essentially kind to you, that you must not allow y<sup>r</sup> self to see those omissions, which perhaps would stare in your face if they came from one to whom you were not so much obliged. I must now tell you that I am very sorry to hear that some liberties you have taken of speech not agreeing with the clymate where you are are so ill taken, that it is observed the King of France plainly resenteth it by the manner of his behaviour to you ; that alone is enough to render your life there less pleasant to you ; but that is not the worst, for you like all other men must presume you have enemies, who, if they can blaze and aggravate the indiscretion of your bringing this upon you it may perhaps have an effect here to your prejudice, and, by lessening the opinion of your conduct, may help to exclude you from any pretentions you may have at your return.

The gravity of advising is as little pleasant to me as it is to any man in the world, but my kindness to you would not hold, and so it hath broken out upon you.

H. Sydney is just now come from Holland ; and the Duke gone three days since for Scotland. Adieu.

On <sup>October 20</sup> <sup>November 8</sup> our diplomatist writes again under a renewed sense of injury.<sup>2</sup> He hears that M. Barillon has

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter xciv., p. 125.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 124.

been intriguing for his recall, and, moreover, that Halifax 1679 himself (though his brother will not believe the story) has 'spoke with trouble' concerning Henry's 'manner of living' at Paris 'in point of debauchery. Sure I am,' exclaims the aggrieved Minister, 'that no part of my life has been so sober.' The answer to this appeal runs as follows :—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*

London, Oct. (Nov.) <sup>13th</sup><sub>21</sub>, '79.

I am willing to take this opportunity of Mr. Temple's going over to send you an answer to the letter received last from you. I find, you had written upon the same occasion to several other of your friends, and we all concur in the opinion that you take the alarm too hot, and that you suspect some for your competitors who are very far from having any ambition to succeed you. H. Sidney assureth us it never came into his thoughts, and I hope Mr. Churchill,<sup>2</sup> whatever inclination he may have to be a minister, will never give such a price for it as the supplanting a friend. What your reasons are of being so fond of it are unknown to me, and I remember there is no disputing about tastes, so I do not enter into the enquiry : it shall suffice me that you like your post, and it must make me contribute all I can to keep you there. As for what you hear of my censures upon you for your debauchery, I hope you do not believe a word of it. I hope I am not so negligent as quite to forget in what style it is fitt for men to speak of their friends ; and I cannot imagine upon what such a lye could be grafted, except it be from my lamenting to some friends upon the occasion of what I writ in my last, that you should be so open in any French company as to expose yourself to any prejudice by the discourse you might have with them, it being so sure they would tell the least thing they would hope to make their court by. I am told too that Mr. Barillon denyeth he ever said anything concerning you, so that your friends agree it would not at all be proper to speak to him concerning it, since it would have no other effect than the making a great matter of that which will not prove so if it be left alone. My condition of health mendeth, but, like most other good things, very slowly the weather being so sharp that it helpeth to keep me back. All here send you their complements, and I am ever yours.

The return of Henry Sidney on leave has been more than once mentioned. His mission had failed. Influenced by fears of our stability,<sup>3</sup> by the threats and the proffers

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter xcvi., p. 128. Misdated by a month ; right date in parentheses. (See original note.)

<sup>2</sup> Afterwards the famous Duke of Marlborough. Savile had been told that he had 'a mind' to supplant the envoy at Versailles.

<sup>3</sup> 'All the world,' he had written to Lord Halifax, 'deferres taking any

1679 of France,<sup>1</sup> the States of Holland, despite the animated exertions of the Prince and Van Beuning, had tacitly rejected the 'Guarantee.' The references of the envoy to the situation as it appeared in England have considerable interest. He observes that the postponement of Parliament was universally regarded as synonymous with an entire abandonment of the popular policy inaugurated during the preceding year. It had therefore disgusted in the highest degree all who pretended to national sympathies.

'Some of our friends,' he wrote to the Prince of Orange,<sup>2</sup> 'are most horribly unsatisfied. . . . Sir William Temple stays at Shene, and never comes to Councils or in to any company. . . . The Duke's party governs.'<sup>3</sup> Halifax he found 'sick and out of humour'—'strongly discontented'—'melancholy and uncertain what to do.'<sup>4</sup> His Lordship sometimes talked of retiring, 'but is not yet resolved on anything;' once he told Sidney the Prince ought still to come over.<sup>5</sup> His ill humour was enhanced by futile negotiations between Sunderland and Shaftesbury,<sup>7</sup> to whom, in anticipation of Lord Essex's retirement, the Treasury was offered, but in vain. A similar offer, with a prospect of the coveted 'White Staff,' found Lord Halifax equally obdurate, though pressed by both Hyde and Sunderland.<sup>8</sup> On the 16th Essex resigned; the King was 'horribly vexed.'<sup>9</sup> 'Lord Halifax,' says Temple,<sup>10</sup> 'in discourse with me, commended him for it, and told me his resolution to go down into the country; and though he could not plant melons as I did, being in the North, yet he would plant carrots and cucumbers, rather than trouble himself any more about public affairs.'<sup>11</sup> . . .

measures till they see in what conditions wee are likely to be among our selves, if we agree, all the Princes of Europe are ready to enter into what Alliances wee please, if they see the contrary they will give all for lost, and make the best conditions with France they can. . . . the Prince of Orange is mightily pleased when I make him any expressions of your kindness and readinesse to serve him,' &c. (Hague, October 11, *Spencer MSS.* 31 [21]).

<sup>1</sup> Which tended towards an alliance between France and the States. The *Dutch Despatches* mention the alarm which this prospect evoked in the minds of Halifax and others.

<sup>2</sup> November 10.

<sup>3</sup> November 15.

<sup>4</sup> November 4, 10, 15.

<sup>5</sup> November 10.

<sup>6</sup> November 10. D'Avaux states that the Prince offered to do so early in December, but his suggestion was not countenanced by Charles.

<sup>7</sup> November 7, 13.

<sup>8</sup> Sidney, November 13; and Halifax (*Devonshire House Notebook*).

<sup>9</sup> Sidney, November 16.

<sup>10</sup> *Memoirs (Works, 1770)*, ii. 520.

<sup>11</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643 shows that Halifax was absent from all the meetings of the Committee during November. The *Dutch Despatch*

To their nearer friends I heard they complained, that they found they had no sound part in the king's confidence or the duke's, that they were but other mens dupes and did other mens work; and that, finding no measures would be taken for satisfying and uniting the kingdom, they would have no more part in public affairs.'<sup>1</sup> 1679

On November 28 the Duke of Monmouth still further complicated the political tangle by a sudden and unauthorised return from the Continent. Dismissed in consequence from all his offices,<sup>2</sup> he assumed, in connection with Shaftesbury, the formal status of an 'exclusion' leader. The Earl inaugurated petitions for an immediate session; the Government retorted with a proclamation against tumultuous assemblies; while its more rabid sympathisers started counter-addresses 'abhorring' the interference with prerogative involved (so they maintained) in the petitions. 'Petitioners' and 'abhorrrers' soon represented the extremists of either faction, and the passions of the moment were aggravated by the tyrannical severity with which 'petitioning' justices were removed from the Commission of the Peace.

On December 1<sup>st</sup>, Henry Savile wrote anew to Lord Halifax, reminding him, in defence of the exaggerated solicitude which the envoy had displayed for his own reputation, that the position wherein he found himself represented his final chance of making a figure in the world.<sup>3</sup> Lord Halifax responded as follows:—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>1</sup>

Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>, '79.

I had yours yesterday, and shall say nothing to the business that hath given you so much disquiet, since your thoughts seem to be calm'd as to that particular; and as for your friends' jealousies that something of the report concerning you might be true, you ought to forgive them, as flowing from their kindness to you, and being acquainted with your natural liberty of speech. Some little breakings out over a bottle of wine might not be thought impossible; but now that is past, and such a report being made will make you the more cautious, and it

(Open) of November 21<sup>st</sup> December 1<sup>st</sup> mentions a report that Halifax—who is described as somewhat unwell, and, erroneously, as having retired to his estates purposes leaving the Council. During December Halifax resumed his attendance at the Committee.

<sup>1</sup> In a letter to his brother, Charles rather mysteriously observes that they 'hung after something he was in hopes they had forgot' (*Life of James*).

<sup>2</sup> Except the Mastership of the Horse, which was put in Commission.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 129.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* letter xcvi., p. 130.



1679 proving false will make your friends less credulous in anything of this kind for the future that concerneth you. I have spoken with my L<sup>d</sup> of Sunderland and H. Guy about your seeking a chapman,<sup>1</sup> and they agree it is very advisable for you, but the difficulty will be to find another Mr. Neale in the world. I very much doubt whether it be possible; besides, at a time that parls<sup>ts</sup> are put off as ours is to next November, and that nothing is talk'd of but retrenchments, men will shrink and be more cautious than ordinary in laying out their money. The King's leave must first be ask'd, and then enquiry must be made for a proper coxcomb to treat with, though beforehand I wish you were sure of one that might be 500*l.* less a fool than Mr. Neale, for all your friends would advise you to close with him. S<sup>r</sup> H. Capel doth not leave the Admiralty, so that you have no prospect there, and indeed I would not have you think of anything else in particular, but if you could make this bargain you would be at present ease; as long as you stay where you are you would not be displeased, and whenever you return you will either get something, or if the thoughts you seem to have now have taken any root in you, you will not think yourself undone by the disappointment. I may by another opportunity say more to you on this subject; in the mean time I kiss your hands. Adieu.

Pray say something for me to my Lady Scroope.

It would appear that an attempt had been made as late as the end of December to re-engage Lords Essex and Halifax in the active business of government. These overtures proved entirely unsuccessful,<sup>2</sup> and immediately afterwards Lord Halifax wrote the following letter to his brother :—

*The same to the same.*<sup>3</sup>

Jan. 1<sup>st</sup>, '79-80.

I do not know what you have done to y<sup>r</sup> nephew, but he is full of kindness for you, and presumeth much upon yours, which maketh him not only willing to go from hence, but impatient till he is with you, and I do with less difficulty comply with him since the parl<sup>t</sup> is put off, which would have been an entertainment of some use as well as pleasure to him. I hope that when he is left to himself without the encumbrance of a governour, he will make a good use of that liberty, and think himself so much the more obliged to improve, to avoid miscarrying under his own conduct; though I presume he will not think fitt to insist so much upon his right to dispose of himself as not to give it

<sup>1</sup> An attempt to dispose of his place in the bedchamber, for which he was anxious to obtain a purchaser.

<sup>2</sup> Lady Sunderland to H. Sidney, December 16 and 30 (Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 207, 217).

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter ci., p. 133.

up to you whenever you will be so kind as to advise him. Our 1679 world here is so over-run with the politicks, the fools' heads so heated, and the knaves so busy, that a wasp's nest is a quieter place to sleep in than this town is to live in, which maketh me so weary of it that you must not wonder if you hear that, notwithstanding my passion for London, that hath been little inferiour to yours for Paris, I go very early this spring into the country, where, besides other invitations, I shall have that of seeing my small works at Rufford, having yet only had the pleasure of disbursing for them. I confess I dream of the country, as men do of small beer when they are in a fever, and at this time poor old Rufford with all its wrinkles hath more charms for me than any thing London can shew me. How long Paris will keep you in love with it I do not know, but I am mistaken if at last Barroughby<sup>1</sup> doth not get the better of it. My uncle Packington<sup>2</sup> is lately dead, but whether you or your nephew will think fit at this distance to mourn for him is left to your better judgements. I am for ever yours.

Halifax did not long delay ere he carried his resolution into practice.<sup>3</sup> By January 23 Dorothy Lady Sunderland informs Henry Sidney<sup>4</sup> that she has forwarded a message to Lord Halifax, 'who is still with Sir William Coventry in the country.' His departure from town seems to have been at the last abrupt, and he left his wife and family in London." By the 30th he was 'stolen down from Sir William Coventry's to Rufford and none of his friends pretend to know whether he will come up any more.'<sup>7</sup>

His motive may be inferred from an event which took place about a fortnight after his disappearance. On January 31, conscious that the petitions for a Parliament had been ineffectual, and disgusted by the King's sudden determination to recall his brother from Scotland, Lords Russell and Cavendish, with Mr. Powle and Sir Henry Capel, retired, on Shaftesbury's advice, from the Privy Council. By leaving town Lord Halifax had avoided the inconvenience of fraternising with any party.

<sup>1</sup> Barroughby, a small estate belonging to Henry Savile.

<sup>2</sup> He had married a Coventry, aunt of the Saviles and reputed authoress of the *Whole Duty of Man*.

<sup>3</sup> On January 11 his last attendance is recorded at the Committee; but his immediate departure does not seem to have been expected.

<sup>4</sup> Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 249.

<sup>5</sup> A letter of Lord Windsor is addressed to his brother-in-law at London, February 2, and evidently presupposes that he had returned thither after consulting Sir William (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [14]).

<sup>6</sup> Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 263.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* i. 273 (Temple to Henry Sidney, February 6).

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VI

*Letter from Algernon Sidney to Lord Halifax.  
(The only one yet recovered).*

For the Lord Halifax.<sup>1</sup>

I may conclude it is a hard thing to find you in this busy time after having sought you in vaine theis four dayes. I had severall things to impart unto you, and one, that may be comprehended in a few words, was to desire you to peruse the enclosed paper containing Sr Nicholas Boughton's <sup>2</sup> case, and if you think it as iust, and deserving to be relieved as all that have hitherto seene it, have done, to desire you to deliver his petition.<sup>3</sup> His present businesse is to desire the protection of the house, whilst the cause is depending before you, which I think, is seldome denied even unto thoes, whoe have not soe good a plea for it. I should have waited upon you this day, but I am going into the citty, and doubt that before I returne, you may be gone as farre out of my reach as at other times, which obliges me to take this way of desiring you to take this businesse into your hands, for which I am very much concerned, and which I hope you may dispatch with very littel trouble

I am

Yours

AL: SYDNEY.

Apr: 16.<sup>4</sup>

I am more pressing in this, because I heare that by an order of your house,<sup>5</sup> all petitions of appeale that are not presented before the eighteenth of this moneth are excluded.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (21).

<sup>2</sup> The printed *Lords' Journals* read the name as 'Stoughton.'

<sup>3</sup> He had been committed by the Court of Exchequer for 'not answering to Interrogatories in a certain cause . . . while he was in Prosecution of [an] Appeal [to the House of Lords. (*Lords' Journal*, xiii. 537).

<sup>4</sup> No year (? 1679).

<sup>5</sup> See *Lords' Journal*, xiii. 498, April 4, 1679.

<sup>6</sup> By *Lords' Journal* of April 25, xiii. 537, Sir Nicholas's petition appears to have been granted.

## CHAPTER VII

IN RETREAT—FEBRUARY SEPTEMBER, 1680 <sup>1</sup>

AT the moment when Lord Halifax left town the Admin- 1680  
 istration, in consequence of the numerous secessions  
 which had taken place, had shrunk to attenuated pro-  
 portions. It now practically consisted of Lord Sunder-  
 land, who had held the seals about a year, with Sydney  
 Godolphin and 'Lory' Hyde, the Duke of York's brother-  
 in-law—two young men who, twelve months earlier, had  
 renounced a diplomatic career for seats on the Treasury  
 board.<sup>2</sup> All these were more or less definitely identified  
 with the interests of the Duke of York; but his ab-  
 sence in Scotland—whence, however, he was almost  
 immediately recalled—rendered them at the moment less  
 amenable to the influence of his autocratic counsels.<sup>3</sup>  
 The violent political agitation with which the country  
 was obviously seething could not escape their observa-  
 tion; and terrified by the almost complete withdrawal of  
 the 'Country' element from the Council, as well as by  
 the menacing attitude of the Exclusionist faction, they  
 were distinctly anxious to propitiate public opinion.  
 The Exclusionist section they regarded as practically  
 irreconcilable; but it seemed not impossible to gain the  
 confidence of the Moderate minority, which, while sound  
 on the principle of succession, had broken with Govern-  
 ment upon the second visit of the Duke of York and the  
 indefinite postponement of Parliament. With an eye to  
 the conciliation of these seceders, alliances with Holland,  
 Spain, and the Protestant Powers were now actively  
 pursued, and it was resolved to anticipate the date of the

<sup>1</sup> The 'eventful year' which, according to Macaulay (*Hist.* chap. ii.) has left 'lasting traces in our manners and language.'

<sup>2</sup> The 'Three Chits' was the nickname bestowed on them by a witty satire variously ascribed to Dryden, to Lord Dorset, and (by Burnet) to the Duke of Buckingham.

<sup>3</sup> But even the Duke, conscious of the forces arrayed against him, was at the moment inclined to conciliation and the Dutch alliance. (See d'Avaux, *Négociations* [edit. Mallet], i. 90-93.)

1680 session so soon as these negotiations should be sufficiently advanced to serve as political capital.

The attitude of Lord Halifax as the leading representative of 'Moderate' feeling attracted peculiar attention, and we are not surprised to find that the Sunderland group attempted to minimise, as far as possible, the significance of his withdrawal. 'The town,' writes Dorothy Lady Sunderland,<sup>1</sup> 'says my Lord Halifax is retired too; he is at Rufford a month sooner than he intended; but I hope he will come again, though he does not stay. I am sure he had resolved to be at Rufford all this spring and summer, four or five months ago. . . . I had a letter just now from Lord Halifax. I find he will not be soon here, but is far from making any meritorious cause of it.' To Halifax himself (her son-in-law, be it remembered) she wrote as follows:—<sup>2</sup>

. . . My dear Lord, I must wish, though I dare do no more, for your making a journey hither the end of March, or beginning of April. The 20th of March, the King goes to Newmarket, and the 25th, my son to Althorpe. They<sup>3</sup> will think, as the mutineers<sup>4</sup> say, that you will come no more till a Parliament sits. As the Queen said of you, I believe you have not told *them* your mind, nor I hope never will; for they are your enemies, and the nation's too, who wish not one honest man near the King. My brother Harry<sup>5</sup> wrote to me, your being in the country is the worst news he has heard a great while: he is so silly as to write to *me*, to beg of you to come again. . . .

Lord Halifax, however, remained inexorable; he sent for his family,<sup>6</sup> and expatiated to his brother on the charms of a country life.

*The Earl of Halifax to H. Savile.<sup>7</sup>*

Rufford, <sup>2</sup>/<sub>10</sub> Feb. '79-80.

I am once more got to my old tenement which I had not seen since I had given order to renew and repair it. It looketh now somewhat better then when you was last here; and, besides the charms of your native soil,<sup>8</sup> it hath something more

<sup>1</sup> To Henry Sidney. (February) <sup>6</sup>/<sub>10</sub>, 1679 (Blencowe's *Sidney*, i. 236-40); it is printed as January 6, a manifest error. (See also a letter of January 30, *ibid.* p. 263).

<sup>2</sup> Probably a few days earlier (no date), letters appended to the *Letters of Lady Russell* (edit. 1819), p. 384.

<sup>3</sup> The King and her son (?).

<sup>4</sup> The extreme party.

<sup>5</sup> Henry Sidney.

<sup>6</sup> Dorothy Lady Sunderland to H. Sidney, February 19 (Blencowe, i. 277).

<sup>7</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter civ., p. 137.

<sup>8</sup> Henry had been born at Rufford.

to recommend itself to your kindness than when it was so mixt 1680  
 with the old ruins of the abbey that it look'd like a medley of  
 superstition and sacrilege, and, though I have still left some  
 decay'd part of old building, yet there are none of the rags of  
 Rome remaining. It is now all heresy, which in my mind  
 looketh pretty well, and I have at least as much reverence for  
 it now as I had when it was encumbred with those sanctified  
 ruins. In short, with all the faults that belong to such a mis-  
 hapen building patch'd up at so many several times, and not-  
 withstanding the forest hath not its best cloaths at this time  
 of the year, I find something here which pleaseth me, whether  
 it be the general disease of loving home, or whether for the sake  
 of variety, since I have been so long absent as to make my own  
 house a new thing to me, or by comparing it to other places  
 where one is less at ease, I will not determine; the best reason I  
 can give is, that I grow every day fitter for a coal fire and a  
 country parlour, being come now to the worst part of my elder  
 brotherhood in having so much a greater share of years than  
 you that it may make amends for the inequality of the division  
 in other respects. The greatest pleasure I have now to hope  
 for dependeth much upon the good advice you will give your  
 nephew, who never shall have any injunctions from me but  
 such as he ought for his own sake to impose upon himself. I  
 think him so capable of succeeding well in the world that it is  
 pity he should miscarry by a wrong setting out at first; there-  
 fore pray let us have a care of his launching, for there is the  
 greatest danger for young men in this age. I bid Gosling acquaint  
 you with the particulars, by which I suppose you will not be  
 dissatisfy'd with my part. I have great reason to be pleased  
 with your kindness to him, but you have drawn an unnecessary  
 incumbrance upon yourself by taking him into your house.  
 Pray make him no complements that give you any trouble, and  
 therefore let him be in some lodging near you, where he may be  
 enough under your eye without giving you the inconvenience of  
 an inmate. It may be a real kindness to inform him sometimes  
 of such things as pass through your hands as are not great  
 secrets, and yet may give him a taste and quicken his appetite  
 to know what passeth in the world. He promised me to read  
 books of treaties and negotiations, in which you may not only  
 encourage but direct him very much to his advantage. It is a  
 great matter for a growing man to apply himself to read what  
 may be of some use, which may be done with as much pleasure  
 at least as in loosing time upon *nouvelles*<sup>1</sup> and *entretiens*,<sup>2</sup>  
 things only fit for young fellows and their wenches to read till  
 the hour of assignation cometh for a more substantial entertain-

<sup>1</sup> *Nouvelles*: 'Certains contes d'aventures extraordinaires, certaines petites histoires faites & inventées uniquement pour l'amusement du lecteur. Les nouvelles de Bocace . . . de la Reine Marguerite . . . de Cervantes . . . de Scarron' (*Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, 4th ed., 1772).

<sup>2</sup> *Entretiens*. The word, in the sense of a work of fiction or light reading, does not occur in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, 4th edition.

1680 ment. You may believe I do not disapprove your raptures in commendation of a retired life, but I will not betray you so far as to incourage you to go beyond the bare speculation till your circumstances are better fitted to put your philosophy in practice. Your company would not have been unwelcome at St W<sup>m</sup> Coventryes, where we could have entertain'd you a little of things that have pass'd in our world, to make you a return to the account you would have given us of France, but amongst the other disadvantages of life it ever happeneth that friends are separated when at the same time we are crowded by our enemies; or, which is almost as bad, by those who are tedious, or at the best indifferent. The D. of Newcastle is just coming in, so I take my leave. - Yours, &c.

During the eight months of dignified retirement which symbolised the withdrawal of Halifax from the political arena, the attentions of every party in turn to the Sphinx of Rufford became assiduous. Lord Sunderland, whose solicitude was quickened by personal apprehension, displayed his usual address, and corresponded with his brother-in-law through the acceptable medium of his mother,<sup>1</sup> between whom and her son-in-law, as already explained, a very real affection existed. The joint exertions of mother and son, so they hoped, might induce Lord Halifax to quit his retirement and afford to the Government, by a resumed attendance at the meetings of the Council, his valuable sanction. The more moderate portion of the Country party, however, including Burnet, Thomas Thynne, and William Coventry, deprecated, with extreme urgency, any such compliance.<sup>2</sup> They appreciated, with an increasing anxiety, the unpopularity which Halifax had incurred during the course of the preceding summer; they trusted that his opposition to the long prorogation and his breach with the Duke might serve to modify the unfavourable impression so created; and they believed that by remaining in the country until the meeting of Parliament he should most clearly express the reality of his discontent. The copious and weekly despatches of Burnet cast a special light upon the relations which prevailed at this time between the two. 'If I had not been encourag'd by my Lady,' he begins,<sup>3</sup> 'to

<sup>1</sup> We quote her letters, throughout, from the collection appended to a volume of Lady Russell's letters published (by Miss Berry) in 1819; but they are more easily accessible in the pages of Miss Cartwright's *Sacharissa*. The originals are in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire.

<sup>2</sup> The letters of Coventry and Thynne are quoted from the originals at Spencer House (box 31, bundles 25 and 51); the letters of Burnet from a MS. letter-book in the same collection (31 [11]).

<sup>3</sup> Letter of February 16, 1690. His letter of April 17 shows that

hope for your Lordships pardon, I should not have presumed to have given you any trouble in this manner. I cannot but think your Lordship very happy in being so long retir'd from the Lies and follies of this Place, and enjoying the ease of privacy with the innocent Diversions that the Country affords. but your greatest advantage, which is most to be envied, is the entertainment your own thoughts give you now, that they are less entangled or heated, and these I am confident, finding nothing abroad equal to them will center in somewhat else, which can only make a Man, Master of himself and of all things without him.'<sup>1</sup> 'I<sup>2</sup> cannot break . . . off without acknowledging the great Honour you do me, when you allow me a share in your good opinion, your Lordship being perhaps the Person in the world I admire the most, and indeed, when one thing comes to be added to your other excellent Qualities, which must give life and lustre to all the rest, for which I daily long and Pray, you will then Captivate all who know you, and I must freely tell you, all is nothing, without that,' &c., &c. 'Your Lordship,' he says on another occasion,<sup>3</sup> 'ends your letter with a mention of Remorse and Repentance, but I am afraid your remorse must lie chiefly upon your encouraging me in this weekly Persecution, and then the Repentance will fall to my share. . . . I deal with you, as those that traded first to the West Indies, who for Bells and Glass beads brought over Gold. . . . I do not wonder that a mind so easy as yours is, should delight in calms, for the restlessness of some mens genius must flow from the want of quiet at home. . . . The most generous ambition of a great mind is to do good, and when the hopes or probabilities of that vanish, no wonder such do more easily go off a more publick Stage, and having nothing left for their Country but their good wishes, retire to a more contracted sphere, where still their Inclinations to do good follows them, and therefore they do not long to hear mischief, though perhaps nothing would make others feel the want of them more sensibly. But though this is a vanity that has corrupted some of the greatest minds, I know your Lordship is above it,' &c.

With his brother meanwhile Lord Halifax maintained a constant correspondence.

Burnet was working in the Cotton Library, collecting materials for the second volume of his *History of the Reformation*, which appeared in 1681.

<sup>1</sup> He evidently refers to the consolations of religion.

<sup>2</sup> Undated letter, probably February 27.

<sup>3</sup> March 13.



*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*Rufford, Feb. 20, 179-80.  
March 2.

1680 I am glad to find that your nephew groweth in your opinion.<sup>2</sup> He is now at the true age of forming himself, and with your assistance and encouragement, I think in the best place for doing it; therefore I hope he will intend it, and think it worth his pains to go about it. I am sure he hath a great belief of y<sup>r</sup> kindness, and that will give you the power of perswading when there is occasion for it; so that I rely very much upon you in all that concerneth him. This is somewhat a greater trust than that of leaving it to you to make my complements wherever you think it necessary, as indeed it was to Mr. Colbert upon such an occasion.<sup>3</sup> I have proposed your demoiselle<sup>4</sup> to my wife, and I find her not averse to taking her, only she, having no exceptions to the servants she hath, cannot put any away without a fault, only to make room, a method, though often used in courts, not so allowable in private families. Upon the first change I will put my wife in mind again, and if your woman is not otherwise disposed she may come; if she is, there is no hurt done. In the meantime my credit with the French Protestants<sup>5</sup> I owe wholly to you; your zeal being so notorious that it throweth a lustre upon all your poor relations. It is enough to be akin to a man that goeth twice a day to Charenton. Heaven reward you for giving such countenance to the Gospel! Sure when you come home and find my Lady Scroope return'd from hearing 4 masses in a morning at Nostre Dame you are both very merry; for I take it to be an equal laughing match between you about your respective devotions. Pray make her my complements, and let this be one of them. We watch here to know how poysoning goeth on at Paris, thinking it may concern us in time, since we are likely to receive hereafter that with other fashions. Methinks you should not lose this opportunity of retrenching your table, you being a man of too much importance to be out of the danger of ratsbane.<sup>6</sup> These things maketh our forest brains turn round; we are apt to think some new evil spirits are broke loose into the world to confound it. Our hope is that Mr. Savile, being a Nottinghamshire man, and once burgess of Newark, will by his influence secure us from

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cvii., p. 143, in answer to a letter dated January 30, 1680. *ibid.* p. 135.

<sup>2</sup> Henry had expressed his pleasure in Lord Eland's society.

<sup>3</sup> M. Colbert had just been appointed Secretary of State.

<sup>4</sup> Henry had recommended 'a well bred woman that would serve a child as half maid and half governess' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 136).

<sup>5</sup> The young person was patronised by 'very considerable' Protestants, who, on the strength of his regular attendance at Charenton, regarded Savile as a pillar of the Church, and who thought Halifax 'a most admirable Protestant;' 'y<sup>r</sup> name,' says Henry, 'being famous ever since the test.'

<sup>6</sup> This refers to the famous Brinvilliers poisoning trials.

the calamities that threaten the rest of mankind ; if you do we shall be bound to pray for your worship, and so I leave you. 1680

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

Rafford, March  $\frac{1}{11}$ , '79-80.

To receive two letters in so short a time from a publick minister, ought to be very kindly taken by a country gentleman, and in gratitude I must in the first place answer that which concerneth you, which is about the suit commenced, or rather renewed, against you.<sup>2</sup> From what pass'd formerly in it, I hope you are not in any danger, but you may be sure that no care shall be wanting to do all that is possible to make a defence, if it should be necessary, which I can hardly think it will be, considering it cometh from the same hand, Mr Meredith, who upon enquiry proves to be a barber in Gray's Inn Lane, but I cannot yet discover upon what grounds he sueth, or whether for himself or somebody that thinketh fit to make use of his obscure name, rather than appear in it themselves. I shall not neglect all means of informing myself more particularly, and that there might be the more time for making enquiries, I got the tryal put off till the next assizes, upon the allegation of your being absent upon the K<sup>r</sup> employment. I did not know but you might possibly have some papers relating to Barrroughby, which might have been of use, but it was out of abundant caution, for I hope that which pass'd last time upon the same business will be a sufficient direction what to do in it now. Y<sup>r</sup> aversion to the remaining in debt must needs produce good effects, for in these cases resolving strongly goeth a great way. Men will find out some way or other of doing whatever they have a very great mind to, and I think the parting with your place<sup>3</sup> is none of the worst expedients, but you cannot reasonably expect at this time Mr Neale's rate for it. I see your kindness to your nephew maketh you think his being in the house with you no incumbrance, so that you are to be left to do what you will in it. I come now to your second letter,<sup>4</sup> which is upon a very kind subject, there being nothing I have in my prospect to please me so much as the settling your nephew to his own satisfaction and the advantage of our family. The proposal<sup>5</sup> you make is in this respect tempting, that by

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cviii., p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> See Savile's letter of February  $\frac{1}{24}$ , *ibid.* p. 139. A litigant was disputing his rights to the estate of Barrroughby.

<sup>3</sup> In the Bedchamber.

<sup>4</sup> Dated February  $\frac{1}{28}$ , *ibid.* p. 141.

<sup>5</sup> Henry Savile was proposing (*Savile Correspondence*, February  $\frac{1}{28}$ , p. 141) a match between his nephew Lord Eland and the 'very pretty daughter' of the 'Marquis de Gouvernette' (Gouvernet), a wealthy Protestant gentleman belonging to an ancient family in Dauphiné. The young lady was fourteen years of age, 'as modestly bred as I have ever seen,' her portion '25,000 pounds.' Her family, who shared the anxieties which at this date (four years before the revocation of 'the Edict') agitated the Protestant community, to which they belonged, were desirous of marrying her

1680 furnishing me with a considerable sum in present I may be enabled to give a large and liberal allowance, without which a young man married in this age liveth with such straitness that it begetteth uneasiness and dissatisfaction, and from thence flow a thousand inconveniences, of which we have almost as many examples as there are marriages, whilst the father is living; but on the other side, there are many objections to be made, as first the alliance, though very honourable, is of no manner of use or support to an English family. Then their way of treating about portions is very different from ours; the husband generally hath only the use, and the principal is to go to the children. But more than all this, in the age we live in, and considering our sky looketh very changeable, and that we do not know what kind of weather we may have, the argument of alliance may grow much stronger, and it may so happen that in a shuffling and distracted time, your nephew may by a wise and reasonable choice, by a thing well timed, do a great deal towards the preservation of his family, if the times be such as to require it. I confess this amongst other arguments hath ever made me the less pressing upon him to marry, and, though it might be more convenient for me at present that he should bring me a portion, yet in my own thoughts I give the preference to that method which may be most advantageous to him and his family. These considerations make me less earnest to embrace your proposal. Indeed, if Harry himself had such a liking to the person as might make him wish for my approbation, it would have great weight with me; but you saying he knoweth nothing what you write, I take him to be wholly unconcerned. In the mean time the thing is so fair, as it is represented to you, that before one would take an absolute resolution it deserveth this enquiry, which you may easily make by the grave acquaintance you mention, viz. to know of her in generall that if you can find her a man of quality for her young woman not to be refused, how much precisely the portion will be, in what manner paid, what settlements and allowances, according to our English way of treating would be expected; the knowing these things can do no hurt, and nobody being named there is no engagement upon us, but we have liberty to choose, and time to think about it. I have heard some of our friends<sup>1</sup> had thoughts of a French match, but till you told me, I did not know it was this. I need not make you any complements upon this occasion, let it be enough that I assure you I am satisfi'd you will never omitt the opportunitys of doing kind things, either to me or your family. I must now give you a friendly advertisement, and, though you may think it a little thing, you must not laugh at me. I hear by accident

in England. The project at this time fell through; but four years later Lord Eland, having become desperately enamoured of the young lady, obtained his father's consent to a union which his own excesses rendered very unhappy.

<sup>1</sup> The Sunderlands.

that you write into England with some freedom of a lady 1680  
 you converse with, and you are so happy in your writing  
 talent that things are repeated and whisper'd for secrets to  
 so many that they will cease to be so at last; but you will  
 remember that the more we deserve jests, the less we bear  
 them, and the more they are commended, so much more they  
 are resented. Upon recollection you must needs understand  
 me, and so I leave it with you. I have made this long enough  
 for a country letter, and therefore it is time to release you, and  
 not disturb your more serious cares for Christendome.

My wife and daughter are very much your servants.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

Rufford, <sup>March 29,</sup> April 6, '80.

Your last<sup>2</sup> was more than ordinarily welcome to me, by  
 holding out some possibility of seeing you if you come into  
 England. I will not let myself hope it too much, for fear of  
 being disappointed, knowing how many excuses a man in your  
 circumstances may have for not taking such a journey. If the  
 charms of your native soil can overcome those difficulties I  
 shall be very glad of it, and old Rufford will put on her very  
 best looks to receive you; but if it should so happen that you  
 cannot, without great inconvenience, spare time for so long  
 a visit, I will meet you halfway, that after so long an absence  
 I may at least have some few hours' talk with you. We shall  
 then have opportunity to discourse fully about the matter you  
 proposed; so that in the meantime it will be of no use to say  
 any thing concerning it to your nephew, or for me to give any  
 farther opinion in it. I need not repeat to you that all possible  
 care shall be taken for the defence of your tenement; but in  
 order to it, if it cometh to a tryal, some writings must be pro-  
 duced; and Talbot affirmeth that Mr. Perkins, the last time  
 this was in dispute, delivered to him some deeds which were  
 carry'd to the assizes, to be produced if there had been occasion;  
 and that he, when he had them, gave them into your own  
 hands, and he thinketh you put them into a cabinet or drawer  
 in your house in King Street. You will do well to recollect  
 y<sup>r</sup>self, and if you remember where they are, to give order they  
 may be given out when they are called for. I see you are a  
 very constant man to your nephew, since you do not think fit  
 to alter your stile of him; in gratitude to you he ought to  
 make good the character you give of him, and I hope he will  
 do so. I believe he is more apt to be faulty in little circum-  
 stances than in great ones, and therefore he must be put in  
 mind that there is a necessary subjection to forms which young  
 men are to submit to; and at the same time it may be very  
 reasonable to laugh at them, it is yet more so to practice them.

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter ex., p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Of March  $\frac{13}{23}$  (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 146).

1680 Little words and motions of respect and civility do often recommend a man more to the company than the knowledge of all the liberrall sciences; but the truth is, all good sense hath something of the clown in it, and therefore though it is not to be suppressed it must be soften'd so as to comply with that great beast the world, which is too strong for any man, though never so much in the right, to go to cuffs with.<sup>1</sup> You guess right both of the lady<sup>2</sup> and the friend<sup>3</sup> you correspond with. I conclude what you write is shew'd by way of applause, and not out of ill meaning, therefore you are to use reasonable caution, but not to take any other notice of it. Wife and daughter kiss your hands, and I am *vous pouvez croire*.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

Rufford, April 24, '80.  
May 4,

Yours by this post<sup>5</sup> was very welcome to me in curing the fears I had for Harry,<sup>6</sup> which were raised from the knowledge I have of his constitution being, like mine, hot, and apt to take more fire than ordinary upon any distemper. I think it will be advisable for him to rest a little after it in some place out of Paris, at his own choice, before he taketh any long journey. Besides, by the complexion of things, one can hardly be secure that Flanders will be a quiet place this summer; and then it would be an unpleasant progress. I am sorry you have put back my hopes of seeing you;<sup>7</sup> but however your friends may be disappointed by it you do well to stay longer upon the grounds you mention.<sup>8</sup> Concerning your writings,<sup>9</sup> I believe your memory may fail you after such a distance of time; therefore the surest way is to send your key over to Mr Robson, there being something to be done next term, in which the deeds found in your cabinet may perhaps be of use. It is still a mystery what this barber<sup>10</sup> goeth upon, though I have employed some to sound him, and am not quite out of hopes but we may get more light than we have yet in this matter. But I wonder you are so ready to trust your throat<sup>11</sup> with a man that would make such a gash in your estate, though I hope he will only be able to show his good will towards it.

The talk goeth here that Flanders is to be sold, but I hardly believe it, not that the Spaniards would not part with it, but that France will not give money for what they may have

<sup>1</sup> One is here reminded of a grandson of Halifax, the Earl of Chesterfield, 'rather a Savile than a Stanhope,' as Mr. Sayle observes (introduction to *Chesterfield Letters* ['Camelot' series], p. viii). (See also Dr. Maty's memoir prefixed to Chesterfield's *Works* [1777].)

<sup>2</sup> Lady Scroope.

<sup>3</sup> Laurence Hyde.

*Savile Correspondence*, letter cxii., p. 152.

Dated April 14, *ibid.* p. 150.

<sup>6</sup> Lord Eland had been unwell.

Savile had applied for leave of absence, to take effect during June.

Connected with his official duties.

<sup>9</sup> About Barrroughby.

<sup>10</sup> The claimant.

<sup>11</sup> Savile had playfully proposed to be shaved by his adversary, in order to take advantage of the loquacity ascribed to his calling.

without it. 'If it should be either given or sold, I think it a wise 1680  
piece of revenge of Spain upon those who would not preserve  
it,' though more nearly concerned. I forget I am at Rufford,  
as ill a clymate for politicks as for melons. Upon recollection  
I leave you to your state contemplations, and am ever yours.

*The Earl of Halifax to Sir Thomas Thynne, Bart.*<sup>2</sup>

Rufford March 3 '79

Since I will yield to no man living in being concerned for  
you, and that your ioyes and your griefes are things I must  
ever have a share in, you must allow mee to tell you, and I  
hope you will easily beleeve mee, that I receive the newes of  
my Uncles<sup>3</sup> death, with the thoughts that become a kind friend  
and servant to yourselfe and your family. I do not love con-  
doling else I had before this lamented my poor Ladyes mis-  
carriage, but I hope my dear friend Harry<sup>4</sup> is well, and that  
you need not dispayre of having your stock increased, though I  
confesse such frequent disappointments must bee very dis-  
couraging;<sup>5</sup> Had my wishes any vertue, yours should never  
fayle, and yet there is as much self interest as kindnesse in it,  
for I do not know anything could contribute more to my own  
happinesse, than to see you and yours prosperous; pray say a  
great deal for mee to the best Woman in the world, and for  
your selfe beleeve mee unalterably

Dear Sr,  
your most faithfull humble servant

HALIFAX

When I was putting up my letter I received yours, and am  
sorry for many reasons you are so unequally dealt with,<sup>6</sup> but  
most especially for one which I need not name to you. In the  
mean time you who can iudge so well of every thing, can best  
do it of your own businesse so that a mans opinion differing  
from yours must bee very impertinent else I confesse my  
wishes are that you would stay in England; I am not willing  
for my own sake to lend so good a friend so farre as Turkey,<sup>7</sup>  
but besides that, I should think the condition of your fortune,  
which as it is lyable to some incumbrances, so it is capable of  
great improvements, would require your attendance upon it,

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the English nation.

<sup>2</sup> *Longleat MSS.*, not addressed. Mr. Thomas Thynne had just suc-  
ceeded to the title on the death of his father.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Thomas Thynne the elder. He does not appear to have been  
an amiable person, and the comments of Lord Halifax seem studiously  
ambiguous.

<sup>4</sup> A son of Thynne's, who eventually predeceased his father.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Thynne (afterwards the first Lord Weymouth) actually survived  
all his children.

<sup>6</sup> The allusion seems to be to the terms of his father's will, described by  
Sir Thomas at length in a letter of March 9 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [51]).

<sup>7</sup> Sir Thomas was anxious to obtain the post of representative to the  
Turkey Company at Constantinople.

1680 and as farre as an ignorant man may venture to guesse, I should apprehend, besides the . . .<sup>1</sup> [haz]ards and discomposing of such a iourney, that you would lose more by your absence, from your businesse here, than your advantages abroad will make you amends for: you will forgive this Random opinion, of mine, and now I have told it, In case you persist in your resolution. If it was in my power, I would not bee lesse zealous to promote, than I am now to dissuade it;<sup>2</sup> for as you have never fayled to oblige mee with your kindnesse, I am bound to returne it in every thought, and therefore your wishes shall ever bee mine being as I am intirely  
Yours.

Meanwhile Burnet was proving himself an excellent correspondent, and forwarding with exemplary regularity the political gossip of the town. On February 27<sup>3</sup> (?) 'The Discourse at Whitehall is all of the Alliances now making up;' and Burnet is 'put in hope . . . that a session of Parliament shall bring' his noble correspondent up to London 'in April.' The Duke and Duchess of York have arrived from Scotland, and have been well received; the Duke of Monmouth is said to have rejected certain overtures made by his uncle. But by March 6 there is no more talk of an immediate Parliament; and the session seems, as before, to be postponed till November. About the 13th, however, the earlier rumour had revived; some wisecracks maintained that upon a disappointment in 'the Farm of the Excise' the Parliament would be immediately summoned, but this was discredited. All the middle of March the Doctor is able to report an extraordinary political lull, which must, he is confident, rejoice the patriotic soul of his correspondent; but by March 27 'Your prognostic,' he writes, 'holds but too sure, That the great calm we were in, might be the forerunner of a Storm.' Certain 'Prentice' riots which had occurred were regarded as the result of Popish intrigues, and in-

<sup>1</sup> Word torn off.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Thomas was defeated in his pretensions by Lord Chandos, who, as Thynne wrote to Lord Halifax, April 26 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [51]), received the support of 'All those who any way dissent from ye Government, w<sup>ch</sup> I owe,' adds Sir Thomas, 'to ye kindnesse of our little friend' (Lord Shaftesbury), 'whose Emisseries solicited against me, even whilst the Court was sitting to Elect.' The circumstance is interesting as showing the animus of the Exclusionists against the Moderates (see also Luttrell, i. 42, and North's *Examen*, p. 466); on the other hand, Charles refused to confirm the appointment of Chandos (a former 'petitioner') till he had made his submission (Kennet, iii. 390; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, p. 167).

<sup>3</sup> The probable date, from internal evidence; the letter is not dated.

<sup>4</sup> We deplore the loss of long answers from Halifax, here mentioned by Burnet.

formations had also been laid which appeared to extend 1680 the area of the Popish Plot as far as Ireland. 'The Coffee Houses,' he observes, 'were in a most languishing condition before, this matter has brought them in heart again.' By April 3 the 'Prentice' scare had subsided; the 'Irish Plot' still held its ground. One passage of this letter has particular interest, though little novelty: 'There was a strange Story published yesterday in Coffee Houses, of which, though I believe not a tittle, yet the setting such things abroad, may be done on design to see how the like might take another time, it was said, that Cosens Bishop of Durham had left a paper seal'd in Sir Gilbert Gerrard's hands, with a charge not to open it till the King was dead, but he had been of late wrought on to open it, and finds it a certificate of that Bishop's having married the King to the Duke of Monmouth's Mother, thus I had from a Person of Honour, who heard it publish'd in the Coffee house.'<sup>1</sup> By April 10 the removal of Sir William Waller (an active Justice of the extreme Protestant type) from the Commission of the Peace 'occasions much discourse.' 'The renouncing of the petitions<sup>2</sup> are said to be put into the Gazettes, to recover the prejudices which were brought on the Kings Affairs in Foreign parts, by the Presenting them . . . your Lordships prognosticks,' adds Burnet, 'are as just as your guessings, for men grow calm again, but retain their disposition still to be inflam'd again with every spark that is blown about. how long the fermentation will continue and advance, especially when so many accidents (conspire?) to feed it, or how tragically it may end I leave to one of your Lordships great knowledge of mankind to judge, to me it looks very melancholly.' Others were equally despondent. Anticipating convulsions at home, William Coventry, despite his valetudinarianism, sometimes dreamt of retirement to the Continent.<sup>3</sup> Throughout England the return of the Duke of York and the influence he exerted upon counsels of State (an influence, at this time, grossly exaggerated by rumour<sup>4</sup>) had excited

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Coventry (who cautiously avoids mentioning the *names* of the supposed contracting parties) also gives the report, to which he attached no belief, in a letter of April 24 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>2</sup> See *ante*, p. 201. •

<sup>3</sup> Letter to Thomas Thynne (*Longleat MSS.*), February 21, 1680.

<sup>4</sup> Hyde and Godolphin were certainly his creatures; but both, as we have already explained, were at the moment intent on conciliatory measures, and Godolphin at length abandoned, during some time, his interests. It was said, however, that Charles complained of his brother's officiousness (Burnet's *Letters*, June 12).



1680 popular suspicion to the point of subdued frenzy. The real, if interested, desire of the Ministry to conciliate public opinion<sup>1</sup> obtained little credence; and scanty importance was attached by the country in general to that foreign policy from which Ministers had hoped so much. The acquittal of an accomplice in the 'Protestant Plot' forgery of the preceding year—an investigation into the 'Black Box' story—the publication of a formal document which branded the Duke of Monmouth with illegitimacy; all these were regarded as instances of gross partiality. The repeated prorogation of Parliament excited a bitter resentment, while, despite the fact that the new House of Commons had never done a day's business, rumours of a summary dissolution were rife.<sup>2</sup> Accident came to aggravate the situation; our dependency of Tangier being threatened by the Moors, the Governor (who, as ill fortune would have it, was a Papist) became suspected of treachery. The assault upon one Mr. Arnold, an active Justice of the Peace, which rumour traced to the same source as the murder of Godfrey eighteen months before, created an almost equal excitement. 'How all good men are affected with this,' writes Burnet, April 17, 'you will find in your own breast. . . . This business is said to be the effect of the Dukes return, and so they say, he will reign, . . . all that malice can cast on him, is now brought up.'

Under these circumstances it is not astonishing that the adhesion of Lord Halifax was more than ever courted by the Ministers.<sup>3</sup> He remained, however, deaf to their expostulations.<sup>4</sup> The urgency of Lord Sunderland, not-

<sup>1</sup> 'My Lady Scroope,' writes Dorothy Lady Sunderland, July 27 (letters appended to the *Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 368) 'is . . . not pleased with my son; she thinks, I believe, he is no friend to them' (the Papists), 'and is too much for complying with the moderate. I do not doubt but that would be the greatest party, if they understood the intentions of others'

<sup>2</sup> Sir W. Coventry, April 15: 'This day the Par<sup>t</sup> was prorogued to May 17. wagers were laid . . . that it would bee a dissolution but it proved otherwise.' April 20: 'I doe not perceive any likelihood of dissolving this Par<sup>t</sup> as yett, but rather thinke they will try them first if they succeed in making the allyances which they hope may mollify the Par<sup>t</sup>!' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>3</sup> 'A great man,' writes Sir William Hickman, March 7, '(not yr brother in law) the other day asked a frend of yrs if he heard from you, and how you did, and when he see you, hee would laugh at you, after a little pawse, would you continue in the country, all summer, he did not think you would have gonne away sow[,] he had heard you say you would goe downe in February or March. but did not think you would have gonne so or in that Passon' (Passion?) (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [36]).

<sup>4</sup> 'I went,' records Reresby, March 10, '. . . to Rufford, where my Lord Halifax was come from Court, and angry with the measures then taken' (*Memoirs*, 1875, p. 181).

withstanding, did not relax; and since Lord Halifax declined to go South,<sup>1</sup> his brother-in-law suggested a conference at Althorpe. 'I shall bring you,' wrote Sir William Coventry to his nephew, April 20,<sup>2</sup> 'some messages from some of your friends.' 'L[ord] S[underland] told mee this morning,' writes Sir William from London, April 27, 'of his expectation of seeing you at Alth[orpe] ere long. hee and his 2 friends<sup>3</sup> seeme very confident of very good and sincere intentions, w<sup>ch</sup> God send to bee soe, and to bee believed.' 'Sir W. C.,' writes Sir William Hickman, April 29, 'will be with you next week, w<sup>ch</sup> I suppose may be before you take a journey I heare you designe.'<sup>4</sup> The report of an impending interview and the actual visit of Sir William to Rufford gave an inevitable fillip to the newsmongers.

'I shall begin with what I heard last night concerning yourself,' writes Burnet, May 8, 'that Two of your Friends,<sup>5</sup> who I suppose are still with you, went from hence with a kind message from the Duke to your Lordship, and to invite you again to Town and to Business.' Sir William himself mentions the rumour. 'The best returne,' he wrote from Rufford, May 10, to Sir Thomas Thynne,<sup>6</sup> 'I can make (from hence) to yrs of 8 is the account of y<sup>e</sup> good health of all heere; This was allwayes a good place, but is now become much more soe, by my L<sup>ds</sup> new contrivances, for w<sup>ch</sup> I allow him to bee soe good an Architect, that (what ever the Towne conjecture of my journey) I am not very apt to remove him, from his enjoying this place as yett, nor doe I find him persuaded hee hath yett had [enough of it] . . . Though the towne make more of my court visitts then the thing will beare,<sup>7</sup> yett I thinke myselfe to come off better than Mr Caleb. . . .'

<sup>1</sup> 'I am vexed,' writes Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Henry Sidney, April 16, 'at my Lord Halifax's not coming to towne. I doubt not but he will. I love things well-timed. I hope some of his wise friends will perswade him' (Blencowe's *Sidney*, ii. 40).

<sup>2</sup> He was at the moment in town on his way to Rufford (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>3</sup> Hyde and Godolphin.

<sup>4</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (36).

<sup>5</sup> Sir William Coventry and probably Sir Thomas Clarges, brother of the first Duchess of Albemarle, long a member of the Country party. (See his character by Burnet, i. 181, 1833.)

<sup>6</sup> *Longleat MSS.*

<sup>7</sup> Coventry had purposely delayed his visit to London, lest, as he said, 'My brother in law' (Shaftesbury) 'make ye world beleieve I come to seeke for an actors place' (letter to Thomas Thynne, February 21, 1670, *Longleat MSS.*). While there, however, business gave him 'opportunity to wait on the E. of Shaftesbury, but,' he adds, 'I doubt that before I doe soe, I shall be obliged to offend him, by waiting on my old Mr' (the Duke of York, who, through

1680

To the Althorpe interview, as we find, Lord Halifax at length consented; 'My son,' writes<sup>1</sup> Dorothy Lady Sunderland, May 18, 'will go in a short time to Althorpe; there my Lord Halifax will meet him, but when he will be here I know not.' Sir William Coventry, who left Rufford (May 18) on another visit, intending to return about June 10, supposed that the meeting would take place during his absence;<sup>2</sup> Lord Sunderland, however, was detained in London by business. At this juncture Lord Halifax again addressed his brother:

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

Rufford, <sup>May 31,</sup> June 10, '80

Your last<sup>4</sup> filled me with the expectation of seeing you ere long, but by the letters from London my hopes are blasted, it being determined it seemeth, for reasons of state that you are for the present to remain where you are; in the mean time you are a man of that importance, that the news both at home and from abroad speaketh of your being recall'd, and a successor named, with as much formality as if there was something in it. One piece of intelligence I confess I am not a little pleased with, which is, that upon a contest you had with his Christian Majesty (we will suppose it was for the honour of England or the advancement of the Protestant religion) he thought fit to give you a cuff on the ear. This was discoursed amongst the most sober newsmongers of St. James's Park, as a real truth, and you cannot imagine how such a thing as this advanceth your reputation amongst all true lovers of the gospel. The King of France hath great pleasure to see how all the world trembleth under him, for I suppose it a satisfaction suitable to his heroick mind; but for my own particular, was I in his place, I could find out a hundred things that would please me more than to keep Flanders and Germany from sleeping for fear of him. These great preparations must have some matter to work upon, and by what I see, wherever he falleth, all the revenge they have upon him is by an immediate yielding to take away the relish of his victory.

The Duke of Norfolk hath been in these parts, though he did not stay long enough for me to see him; he intendeth to return into Flanders, and come back into England at Michael-

Thynne, had desired this interview). 'I thinke,' he continues, 'I cannot decline it, though I foresee his Lo<sup>r</sup> will not faile mee upon the point, but having nothing to arrive at by popularity, obloquy signifies the lesse' (letter to Lord Halifax, April 15, *Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]). 'The Little man you mention,' he says elsewhere, 'grows every day lesse, even amongst those from whome hee hopes his greatnesse should spring' (*ibid.*, April 20).

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Henry Sidney (Blencowe's *Sidney*, ii. 61).

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Sir Thomas Thynne, May 17 (*Longleat MSS.*); letter to Lord Halifax, May 27 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxiv., p. 155.

<sup>4</sup> Probably of May 1<sup>st</sup>, *ibid.* p. 153.

mas. In the mean time, he sendeth me word, he is preparing 1680  
Glossop in Derbyshire for his retreat. S<sup>r</sup> W. Coventry is in  
Westmoreland<sup>1</sup> at this time, and was pleased with the hopes  
he had of meeting you here on his return. It seemeth Harry<sup>2</sup>  
hath made choice of Bourges to pass the summer in, and  
sayeth when he is there he will give me an account how he  
liketh it. I take it to be a good sign that you like him so well,  
and you may be sure I cannot have any so pleasant thought as  
that of hoping he may succeed well in the world. In the mean  
time I leave you to your fine walks, yet would have you to  
know we have our shades and groves too; it is true the sun  
hath not yet provoked us to make much use of them. Wife  
and daughter kiss y<sup>r</sup> hands, and I am, &c.

The delay of the Althorpe interview had allowed free  
course to the gossip of the coffee-houses.

'I heare,' writes Sir Thomas Thynne, June 8,<sup>3</sup> 'y<sup>r</sup> Inter-  
veiw is putt off for some time, ye noise of it has occasioned  
much discourse, not against ye will of those y<sup>e</sup> were to  
meet.' Eventually, however, a date was approximately  
settled. 'I am, my dear Lord,' writes Dorothy Lady  
Sunderland, June 9,<sup>4</sup> 'now employed by my son to write to  
you, though he intends to do it himself this night; but he  
is not sure of his time because my brother' is expected  
every minute. He bid me tell you he cannot be at  
Althorpe this fortnight. He desires you will not dis-  
appoint him of seeing you; he says he has a great deal to  
tell you, and that you will like very well. I have heard  
that, which makes me hope the King will disappoint those  
that are enemies to him and peace, by the best arms he  
can do it with—acts of justice, moderation, and observing  
the laws, and the using no tricks, but dealing sincerely,  
openly, without any secrets, especially such as passed  
between my Lord Danby and Mr. Montague.'

Within twenty-four hours matters had still further  
advanced, and she was able to write:<sup>5</sup> 'By this post you  
will receive my son's desire to meet him:' (i.e. for *you*  
to meet him) 'on Tuesday he intends to go. He says  
you will, he knows, be well satisfied with what is already  
done and intended. My brother Harry will go to Althorpe:

<sup>1</sup> He was staying with his niece, Lady Lowther, a sister of Thomas Thynne. He found the climate depressing. It had rained when he had last seen the neighbourhood in 1648; it was still raining. Did it, he plaintively inquired, *always* rain? (letter to Lord Halifax, dated Lowther, May 27, *Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>2</sup> Lord Eland.

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (51).

<sup>4</sup> Letters appended to the *Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 327.

<sup>5</sup> Henry Sidney.

<sup>6</sup> *Letters*, p. 337. It is there dated 20th, evidently erroneously (see *Diary of Henry Sidney*), and we may confidently ascribe it to the 10th.

1680 he longs to see you, he says, and more of your friends : I saw them both<sup>1</sup> yesterday, and they told me so.' Mr. Sidney had been temporarily recalled for the signature of a treaty with Spain, of which he brought over the draught.<sup>2</sup> He was convinced, as Lady Sunderland declares, that 'by Michaelmas, almost all the Princes of Europe' would join the League against France, if not frightened by our divisions.<sup>3</sup> She represents the advanced party as deeply chagrined by this diplomatic success ; Lord Shaftesbury had said, 'in presence of her brother-in-law Smith, that the League with the Dutch was calculated to 'fool the Parliament.' 'These,' ejaculates the incensed lady, 'are good Englishmen and Protestants ! . . . I am never,' she adds, 'better pleased than when I am told those things will be done that my Lord Halifax will approve ; for then I am sure that is good for the nation ; and my son being for those ways too, is a satisfaction to me.'

Far otherwise wrote Sir Thomas, who, at his cousin's desire, had sounded the Country party in regard to the impending interview : -

*Sir Thomas Thynne to the Earl of Halifax.*<sup>5</sup>

June 13, '80.

. . . . I have shewed yr letter to both y<sup>r</sup> persons y<sup>n</sup> desired. Sr W. H.<sup>6</sup> is of opinion y<sup>n</sup> should not decline y<sup>n</sup> meeting least it should prejudice y<sup>n</sup> with y<sup>e</sup> Kg. Sr W. . . .<sup>7</sup> is of a quite contrary iudgement, y<sup>t</sup> it will inevitably make y<sup>n</sup> worse with y<sup>e</sup> generality, and bee lyable to y<sup>n</sup> mis representations heat of argument may produce, and therefore absolutely dissuades it. it is impertinent for me to adde my symbole, but I ioyne with ye later especially considering how much discourse it has already occasioned, and what use y<sup>r</sup> bro. Sund. makes of it ; who makes it his publique table talke, and seems to insinuate as if that were ye motive to his coming to Althorp. Mr Finch dined with him on Friday when it was y<sup>e</sup> whole discourse ; J.<sup>8</sup> bids me tell y<sup>n</sup>, y<sup>t</sup> wee have obeyed y<sup>n</sup>, have laught at ye least ; y<sup>t</sup> 'tis [cer-

<sup>1</sup> Hyde and Godolphin (?).

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, *Letters*, June 12.

<sup>3</sup> The fear of our dissensions finally prevailed, and only the alliance with Spain succeeded (d' Avaux, i. 96).

<sup>4</sup> Or Mr. Hampden had said to Lord Shaftesbury ; her ladyship's use of personal pronouns is confusing.

<sup>5</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (51).

<sup>6</sup> William Hickman (?).

<sup>7</sup> Probably 'W. J.' (William Jones) ; the initial in the original *resembles* rather a D. This remarkable man, one of the ablest lawyers in England, had since the 'Plot' scare attached himself to the 'Country' party, and had during the preceding October laid down the Attorney-Generalship. The Court regarded him as an Extremist, and he became subsequently violent for the Exclusion.

<sup>8</sup> Jones (?).

tain?] L. II.<sup>1</sup> has of late made him many visits and ye largest 1680  
 offers y<sup>n</sup> can imagine, not onely a restoration, but a much greater  
 preferment (w<sup>ch</sup> by circumstances from him; and discourse with  
 others I finde was to bee Ld. Chan<sup>r</sup>) but yt he has absolutely  
 refused all returne;<sup>2</sup> and y<sup>t</sup> were his place now to bee re-  
 signed, he would doe it to morrowe, yt he will never come in  
 before y<sup>n</sup>, and he thinks not after y<sup>n</sup>, unless there be a strange  
 alteration of affairs and temper, y<sup>t</sup> L. II.<sup>1</sup> was with him this  
 weeke . . . y<sup>t</sup> he findes they indeavour to gaine men of credit  
 to their party, and would faine get countenance. he was not  
 much surprised at L. Essex's letter, it being his custome he  
 says to accomodate his discourse to y<sup>e</sup> persons he talkes with,<sup>3</sup>  
 he<sup>4</sup> is at present very assiduous at Councell; seldome failing to  
 meet y<sup>e</sup> Kg. here; and in his talke with me professes all things  
 are naught that ye intentions are not good, nor ye professions  
 sincere; he spoake very kindly of y<sup>n</sup> to me, y<sup>t</sup> he thought you a  
 thorough honest man, the report of y<sup>t</sup> speedy coming up is very  
 universall and J. tells mee it is strengthened by a letter my  
 Lady wrote to my Lady Clare<sup>5</sup> y<sup>t</sup> in a short time she hoped to  
 see her, I assured him it was a mistake, and y<sup>t</sup> if any such  
 letter were, it must bee y<sup>t</sup> my Lady hoped she would come  
 downe, not yt she was likely to come up to her. if the Parl<sup>t</sup>  
 doe not meet in winter (as I see noe reason it should, considering  
 ye fury of ye people, and contempt they have for ye Trium-  
 virate:<sup>6</sup>) y<sup>t</sup> I<sup>p</sup> must be contented to stay in ye country, for it  
 will be very preiudiciall for y<sup>n</sup> to bee in Towne; J. has refused  
 to meet my I<sup>d</sup> Sund. at a lesse distance then Althrop,<sup>7</sup> and  
 agrees y<sup>t</sup> ye little man<sup>8</sup> is out of his senses; he labours what  
 he can to drawe L. Russell from him, but yt cannot bee  
 done:<sup>9</sup> the reputation of ye victim [? the Duke of Monmouth]  
 dwindles mightily . . . I<sup>d</sup> Sund. is very brisk, and thinks this  
 Alliance will make him ye Nations favourite, but all he can doe  
 will not make men thinke well of him. . . .

The meeting so long discussed took place, however, eventually, despite these remonstrances. The leading Ministers in a body, accompanied by Henry Sidney, went down to Althorpe; as it would appear, for this express purpose.

'I went,' writes Henry Sidney,<sup>10</sup> 'to Althorpe and

<sup>1</sup> Laurence Hyde (?).

<sup>2</sup> H. Sidney at this time thought Jones inclined to take office.

<sup>3</sup> See Devonshire House 'note book.' <sup>4</sup> Essex. <sup>5</sup> Her sister.

<sup>6</sup> I.e. the 'Chits' or 'second Triumvirate' (Hyde, Godolphin, Sunder land).

<sup>7</sup> He evidently means that J[ones] had refused to meet the Ministers, though his doing so in London would be a much simpler, and therefore less noticeable, matter than the proposed Althorpe interview.

<sup>8</sup> Shaftesbury (?).

<sup>9</sup> The influence which Lord Shaftesbury possessed over Lord Russell is well known; the spell dissolved later on. (See Devonshire House 'note book.')

<sup>10</sup> *Diary* (edit. Blencowe), June 15, ii. 75.

1680 staid there till the 22nd. There was my Lord Halifax, Mr. Hide, Mr. Godolphin, and Mr. Shepherd; we gave him (Halifax) so great satisfaction that he will again come amongst us. He enquired much after the Prince of Orange. . . .<sup>1</sup> I had again another conversation about the Prince's coming. They think his being here will put an awe upon people and hinder them from being stark mad, which is all we desire. Monsieur Van Lewin, being Extraordinary Ambassador, will contribute a great deal to shew the concern that the States have, that the King and Parliament should agree, and let them know all is lost without it. The King will desire no money, unless his alliances will require it; *he will have all acts for securing them against popery, but will not meddle with the succession.*<sup>2</sup> He will have the Parliament meet sooner than was intended.'

The passage which we have given in italics demands our special attention. Lord Halifax, in other words, while resolved upon continuing his retirement until the opening of Parliament, agreed to support his brother-in-law during the ensuing session in pursuit of the policy adopted by the 'Triumvirate' of the preceding year; including under this head *the substitution of Limitations for the Exclusion*; and, as regards Continental affairs, *an attitude of direct opposition to France*.

Lord Halifax appears to have returned from Althorpe on the evening of the 21st, and the excitement created by his visit was such as had been anticipated by Sir William Coventry,<sup>3</sup> who had only delayed his own departure from Rufford in order to hear the result. 'y<sup>e</sup> have made all ye discourse this last weeke,' writes Sir Thomas Thynne on the 22nd,<sup>4</sup> 'and silenced black box Tangier and all other Coffee house news.' Burnet<sup>5</sup> is equally emphatic; and we trace in his observations a decided stiffness of tone.

<sup>1</sup> 'I asked why they sent for the Duke, because he would have come without it.'

<sup>2</sup> The italics are our own.

<sup>3</sup> Letter to Thomas Thynne, June 19 (*Longleat MSS.*): 'My Landlord is not yett returned from his Interview, nor doe we expect him till Monday, because hee goes thence to Fotheringay, to settle some of his affaires w<sup>h</sup> need his presence. . . . I easily beelve those who have little else to talke of will make enough of my L<sup>ds</sup> interview, but I hope hee will take care their talke shall dye, when they see no consequences of the meeting. I stay heere till hee returne. . . . I had once thoughts of coming to London and to the Ranger' (Henry Coventry was Ranger of Enfield Chase), 'but . . . the consideration of the talke it might make (if I came soe soone upon the interview) has turned the scale.'

<sup>4</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (51).

<sup>5</sup> *Letters*, June 19, 1680.

'I might well spare your Lordship this trouble since you will from much better hands have heard how things go, for you will not think it strange if the Town that is apt to talk of everything makes great inferences from an appointment made between the Earl of Sunderland and Mr. Sidney and you at that Earls house, which is design'd as the newsmongers say, to bring your Lordship again into Affairs.' 'Since,' he adds, June 26, 'you were so lately with men who governs all the Councils and so can give a man a light to know things for a great while to come it were very impertinent to trouble you with a long letter.' Lord Halifax appears to have responded to these implied reproaches, and others of the kind, in a circular letter, or letters, distributed by private hands among his acquaintance of the Country party.<sup>1</sup> The object seems to have been to assure his friends that he had no immediate intention of returning to town or of resuming an active part in politics;<sup>2</sup> but this transaction was reported to Lord Sunderland in a very unfavourable light, as appears from the following letter :

*The Earl of Sunderland to the Earl of Halifax.*<sup>3</sup>

I received your Letter with greate Satisfaction and will take care that the next time you come to Altrope your ague shall have (?) no kinde of encouragement. I have been told by severall People that you have writ to some heere that you had met dangerous Company but you would take care not to be caught. and much more to that Purpose. I made no answer to it but that I did thinke that was your Stile. it being ill suited to Men who did not care to catch any body I write no newes because I knowe you will heare from others all. and fifty times more than I can thinke of or have heard. I am intirely yours.

S.

London June the 29.

From the letters of Dorothy Lady Sunderland it appears that Sir Thomas Thynne was the supposed

<sup>1</sup> Burnet, June 26 : 'As I must acknowledge the favour your Lordship did me in ordering your man to call upon me, so I am to beg pardon for a presumption I was guilty of, finding you had forgot to name Sir Francis Winnington I presum'd so far as to advise him to call on him in your name, for which if I mistake you not, you will not blame me much.' Winnington, a lawyer in great practice (Seward, *Anecdotes*, ii. 94), who had once been Solicitor-General, had joined the ranks of the Extremists. On June 12, however, he had sent to Halifax through Burnet his 'most humble duty' with the addition that he loved him 'with all his heart' (Burnet's *Letters*).

<sup>2</sup> 'Your Lordship cannot think it strange,' writes Burnet, July 3, as if in answer to representations, 'that in a time of so much business, a journey made by all our Great Ministers was believ'd to be more than a bare visit.'

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (20), endorsed 'June 29. 80,' and addressed to Rufford.



1680 delinquent. 'He particularly,' she writes,<sup>1</sup> 'but some others too, have said that you have written letters to them, to assure them that, though there were snares laid for you, they should find you would not be caught. My son says, he does not believe a tittle of it; yet he and Mr. Hyde have been told that Thynne has not only said it, but given out copies of the letters that you wrote to him to this purpose, to several persons. For my part,' adds *Sacharissa* vindictively, 'I believe whoever will give a copy of a friend's letter, will frame it all, and your cousin's reputation, between man and man, is bad enough for it I assure you,'<sup>2</sup> &c., &c. On the 3rd<sup>3</sup> she is conscious that she 'ought to ask pardon for being too bold with any that pretend to be friends to my dear Lord Halifax . . . but I think, as I did then, that they are liars.' By July 8<sup>4</sup> it was 'I most humbly beg your pardon, my dear Lord, for being too bold with any relation of yours, but kindness to you is so good a ground, it can hardly produce a fault. My son and I took it the same way; was angry with those who did endeavour to make a difference, without a thought of your having the least part in it . . . when I was cool, I did not think Sir Thomas Thynne would do so ill a thing to you,'<sup>5</sup> &c., &c.

Her ladyship's lively epistles meanwhile, apart from their more intrinsic purpose, are full of amusing political or semi-political gossip, principally illustrative of her dislike for the extremists and her natural partisanship for her son. She did not, however, lack more agreeable topics.

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Halifax, July 1 (letters appended to the *Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 341).

<sup>2</sup> 'and so I will tell him,' she adds, 'that he will be a good while before he is bought off by any place from his mutiny, which he is thought to have as much mind to, as any mutineer of them all,' &c. &c. (*ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 346.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 353.

<sup>5</sup> Her denunciations did not affect the relations between the cousins (Henry Savile to Lord Halifax, Windsor, July 7, *Savile Correspondence*, p. 160): 'I saw Sr Tho. Thynne at your house at London; it is a pleasure to me to see the most unreserved friendship he has for you; he is in good earnest a very honest gentleman.' To this Lord Halifax refers in the following letter addressed to his cousin (the Earl of Halifax to Sir Thomas Thynne, *Longleat MSS.*): 'For Sr Thomas Thynne at Halifax house London. July 5 '80. I have sent a letter by another way, so that this will say little more than to acknowledge the receipt of yours; my brother telleth mee by this post that hee is upon his returne againe, so that I must despayre of seeing him; in the mean time I find in the short conversation hee had with you, you expressed so much kindnesse to your old friend, that though it ought to bee no new thing, hee thought fit to congratulate with mee for it. I say nothing in returne, but that the most impossible thing in this world is that I should ever cease to bee Intirely, Yours, H.'

She retails the encomiums of Lord Eland which the ever 1680  
active Lady Scroope reported from Paris; he had won  
golden opinions, and had shown himself greatly attracted  
by M<sup>lle</sup>. de la Tour.<sup>1</sup> Harry Savile pays a brief visit to  
England; and the unwonted slenderness of his person,  
with the foresight which had induced him to bring a  
handsome present for the Royal mistress, appear to have  
afforded Lady Sunderland equal satisfaction. Much to  
the disappointment of Lord Halifax, however, the meeting  
between the brothers was postponed.

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>2</sup>*

Rufford, July 7, '80.

It is a cruel thing your stay in England should be so limited  
that it is impossible for me to hope to see you, a thing I wish  
for many reasons, there being a great many things of several  
kinds both private and publick that it might be of some use as  
well as satisfaction to us to talk of. But you are a man of that  
importance to the world that all your minutes are precious, and  
so your poor country friends must be content. In the mean  
time we rely upon you that you will stop the K. of France from  
doing any hurt in Flanders, supposing you have power with  
him, notwithstanding your late disputes.<sup>3</sup> Your countermand  
about the couple of pads was unnecessary, for the truth is, it is  
almost as possible to get a horse that flyeth as a horse that  
paceth, I mean one that doth it well, so rare that kind of  
creature is grown amongst us, and for my own stock you know  
how I used to be provided,<sup>4</sup> though I intend for Harry's sake  
to have my stable better furnished. If I had ever a one fit for  
you he should be at your service without the help of a third  
person to intercede for it.<sup>5</sup> If you have a mind to tell me any-  
thing you do not think fit to trust the post with, my servant in  
town will be able to convey it safely to me; you will let me  
know whether you can get your tether lengthened, and the time  
you are certainly to return again. Adieu.

<sup>1</sup> Daughter of the Marquis de Gouvernet, the young lady previously  
recommended by Henry Savile. (See *ante*, p. 211.)

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxviii., p. 160.

<sup>3</sup> An allusion to the absurd report given in the Earl's letter of <sup>May 31</sup><sub>June 10</sub> (q.v.).

<sup>4</sup> Halifax was notoriously deficient in the sporting tastes of the ideal  
country gentleman. In a letter of April 15 Sir William Coventry had  
written: 'My L<sup>d</sup> Burlington coming in commands mee to tell you that not  
seeing how it is possible for you to divert y<sup>r</sup>selfe in the country w<sup>th</sup>out,  
he concludes you have sett up both for horses & dogs, for w<sup>h</sup> (hee saith)  
you use to rally him.' 'I know too well,' says Henry Savile in the letter  
to which this of Halifax is an answer, 'what sort of palfrys your L<sup>th</sup> uses  
to be stored with to apply to you when I would have a very good one.'

<sup>5</sup> Savile had apologised for the officiousness of an ignorant servant in  
the matter (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 158).

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

July 5, '80.

1680 I find our meeting,<sup>2</sup> for reasons of state, is to be prorogued ; all that I am now to hope is that some sudden occasion will send you back again in the winter, and then probably I shall not be at this distance. The disappointment of not seeing you now is grievous, having so many things to say to you, and as many to know of you : in the meantime how cometh it to pass that you put that affront upon my poor tenement as not to make it your lodging when you are in town ? your acquaintance of all sorts might have access to you, and I should not at all be scrupulous, or think my house unsanctified by any use you can put it to. I believe you find the scene a good deal alter'd since you left us, and in that respect your journey will be of some advantage to you. I hope it will be in other things so too ; this being a favourable conjunction for you to recommend yourself by acquitting yourself well of whatever is intrusted to you. S<sup>r</sup> W<sup>m</sup> Coventry gave me a hint in general of something concerning yourself,<sup>3</sup> by your order, and I am not curious enough to inquire into the particulars, except I could serve you in them, which I am sure I cannot whilst I am here. I have not lately heard from our young man ;<sup>4</sup> when I did, he was recovering, but I am a little troubled his distemper should stay so long with him. I have upon search found the writings that I hope will be necessary for your defence ; so that you have no more to do but to send for Mr. Perkins, who I suppose is in town, to inform yourself of your business, and if possible, to drink a bottle with Mr. Meredith, to find out in his ale upon what grounds he goeth, and who sets him on. My wife and daughter kiss your hands. Adieu.

While on leave Henry Savile had opportunities of studying the situation. He found the friends of Lord Halifax still sufficiently divided as regards the expediency of his revisiting town. 'Those,' he says,<sup>5</sup> 'who lately met you on purpose to invite you thither are violent in it :'<sup>6</sup> others<sup>7</sup> are as eager for your staying where you are till the very day before the parl<sup>t</sup> sits, thinking you

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter exix., p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. meeting of Parliament.

<sup>3</sup> Probably his pretensions to the Vice-Chamberlainship, which he obtained within a few days.

<sup>4</sup> Lord Eland.

<sup>5</sup> Letter dated from Dunkirk (after his return to his official sphere), July 15<sup>th</sup> (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 163).

<sup>6</sup> Godolphin on July 13 wrote 'pressingly,' saying 'All will go well, &c. the King well disposed' (The Halifax 'note book' at Devonshire House).

<sup>7</sup> Including, we may imagine, Sir W. Jones. 'On Monday,' says W. Coventry, July 28, 'S<sup>r</sup> Wm Jo: sent over to me, that in regard hee had drank waters he could not come to mee but would be glad to see mee ; I went to him, and found his only business was concerne for you about y<sup>e</sup> coming up, hee told mee hee had written to you that day.'

may hazard the repute they think your absence has gain'd 1680  
 you amongst such as thought you had too great a hand  
 in some matters the last year w<sup>ch</sup> were not generally  
 approved of. Of all this I am a very ill judge. . . . In the  
 mean time . . . by the face of our court, *I thought*<sup>1</sup>  
*people began to be tired out in endeavouring to support*  
*what cannot possibly be long supported*, and that no delays  
 or expedients can justify.'<sup>2</sup> It is hard to say whether  
 Savile here alludes to the interests of the Duke of York,  
 to the design of an Anglo-French understanding, or to  
 the cause of Popery.

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

Rufford, <sup>July '84</sup>  
 August 3 '80.

I have yours from Dunkirk,<sup>4</sup> where I find you have unwelcome bed-fellows ;<sup>5</sup> but men of business must be content with these small mortifications. If your house at Barroughby was not somewhat out of repair you might sleep cool and quiet. And now I mention your tenement, I am to tell you your high and mighty antagonist is resolved not to try the combat with you this assizes ; in that he is like the King of France, who you say intendeth to prorogue his conquests till another year. Your attorney Perkins hath had conference with this foe of yours, of which I have not yet the particular account. I only know he will not at present go on with his tryal, and that he pretendeth some grant in the last King's time, which shall be search'd for. We were ready for him, and since he hath given a second disappointment, it may perhaps be necessary to fall upon him in Chancery, for disquieting you in your possession, but this shall be well consider'd ; and therefore I do not tell it you as a thing yet resolved ; this may be the best and most natural pretence for your desiring me to meet you half way to town when you come back again,<sup>6</sup> in case I should not be there, which it is possible I may be if your intended stay should be any thing prolonged ; in the meantime I am very glad you had ground whilst you were at court to make the conjectures you mention. It is not a good thing to rely upon ; but men may be saved by a death-bed repentance, and why not a state so too ? It is good to hope it, and it would be a sin not to try it. I had a letter lately from our young man,<sup>7</sup> who is well, but has not recover'd his strength. Poor old Rufford mourneth that she could not see you ; now she has her best cloaths on she hath little to brag of, yet she sayeth her flyes are harmless, and the air is clear ;

<sup>1</sup> The italics are our own.

<sup>2</sup> Evidently to the people.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter exxii., p. 165.

<sup>4</sup> See *ibid.* p. 163. He was following the French King on a progress.

<sup>5</sup> Poor Henry had complained bitterly of the uninviting accommodation at Dunkirk.

<sup>6</sup> Savile had obtained a promise of further leave (*Savile Corres.*, p. 161).

<sup>7</sup> Lord Eland.

1680 and, if it was possible for a statesman to love ease and quiet and silence, you would rather enjoy them with bilberry's than eat melons in the crowd and dust of a wandering court.<sup>1</sup> This she biddeth me tell you, which is all, but that I and every body here are much at your service.

The attitude of Lord Halifax continued to form the topic of endless conjecture. ' . . . yu are already in the storme before yu put y'selfe in it,' writes Thomas Thynne, August 5,<sup>2</sup> 'your letter to W.[illiam] J.[ones]<sup>3</sup> having bin shewed or told to every body; and more noise made of it then yu intended or can imagine. W.[illiam] H.[ickman] will bee with yu speedily and give y<sup>e</sup> not onely ye sense of y<sup>e</sup> friends, but y<sup>e</sup> Enemies w<sup>th</sup> is sharpe enough.' Rumour not only affirmed, and with truth, that Lord Halifax was contemplating a return to town in about a month's time, but also, with absolute falsehood, that the Government had endeavoured to secure his services at the price of the Irish Lieutenantcy.<sup>4</sup> 'I heare from London,' writes William Coventry, August 3, 'a

<sup>1</sup> Louis was on a progress, and had apparently reached Dunkirk.

<sup>2</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (51).

<sup>3</sup> See p. 228, note 7.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet, *Letters*, July 30: 'The Earl of Ossory [eldest son of the Duke of Ormonde, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland] died last night. . . . I am glad to hear your Lordship is to be here within a month, tho' I doubt whether I should so far entertain an idle story as to repeat it to you, That you are to go to Ireland, which you may be sure I do not believe.' Dorothy Lady Sunderland, August 5, says: 'Everyone thinks the Duke of Ormond will quit the government of Ireland or be persuaded to it' (on the death of his son). 'My son told me he had by some been desired to get it . . . he will not quit the post he is in. . . . At the same time, he had, it seems, on some occasion offered to answer for you, that you would not have it. My Lord Shaftesbury raves of one of you two going into Ireland' (letters appended to the *Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 372). 'The Earl of Ossory,' says Carte (iv. 609), 'had not been dead three weeks before the Duke of Ormond's enemies . . . renewed their efforts to remove his grace.' Both Ormonde and Carte appear to have supposed that Halifax really desired the post. This is evidently erroneous.

The letters of Burnet about this time mention the death of the famous penitent, Lord Rochester, on whom he had attended, and of whom he subsequently wrote a memoir: 'all the Town is full of his great penitence, which by your Lordships good leave I hope flows from a better principle than the height of his fancy.' Burnet had informed the dying man of Lord Halifax's concern on his behalf; Rochester had returned his humble thanks, 'and added, that you were the Man in the World he valu'd most, he believ'd you were melancholly on the account of the Publick and so turn'd to another discourse' (letters of June 12 and July 29). It is evident that Burnet recurs to the subject with intention, since Rochester had been a professed scoffer at the Christian faith. Burnet also mentions (letters of July 17 and August 7) the opposition offered by the Court to his own proposed appointment as incumbent of either St. Martin's or Covent Garden, with the kind zeal shown on his behalf by Lord Russell and by Halifax himself. He also (letter of July 29) acknowledges a donation of 10*l.* from Lord Halifax in favour of the French Protestant refugees.

rumour of a remarkable piece of continence in y<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>p</sup> as 1680  
 if you had lately withstood some eminent temptations, of  
 w<sup>h</sup> I will say noe more in this, but that I am glad of it,  
 very glad.' Two days later he adds, from London, 'by  
 the little I heare since I came hither, I doubt the rumour  
 I told you I mett w<sup>h</sup>, of y<sup>r</sup> great continence, w<sup>h</sup> I con-  
 gratulated w<sup>h</sup> you, proves but a rumour, and is already  
 vanished, and is supplanted by the discourse of y<sup>r</sup> coming  
 the 1<sup>st</sup> weeke of September, w<sup>h</sup> is said soe commonly (and  
 by some w<sup>th</sup> such authority) that I have noe ground to  
 hope the contrary, but that y<sup>r</sup> letter to S<sup>t</sup> Tho Thynne  
 implies that you thinke advice needfull, w<sup>h</sup> makes mee  
 hope you have not concluded the point as yett. you are  
 not likely to see him a good while, but I hope you will  
 another good friend very soone, and then you will not  
 resolve anything soe soone as to preelnde y<sup>r</sup> owne judging,  
 when you shall understand from him how all things stand.  
 Truly I thinke it concernes you very highly not to mis-  
 take y<sup>r</sup> steps now, as highly as ever it did therefore I beg  
 of you not to conclude any thing till you are fully informed.<sup>1</sup>

Eventually, despite these friendly remonstrances, Lord  
 Halifax resolved upon starting for town about the middle  
 of September. An anxiety to study the situation for him-  
 self, before the meeting of Parliament, seems the most  
 probable motive.

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>2</sup>*

Rufford, Sept.  $\frac{1}{4}$ th, '80.

\* I had yours by this post with your kind summons to meet  
 you at Potheringhay, but you have by this time one from me to  
 acquaint you with my resolution of setting out from hence the  
 very same day you seem to pitch upon for your return into  
 France, so that if your business will allow you to stay three or  
 four days longer, I may see you with much less inconvenience  
 to you than if you should take a journey for it. You may  
 easily guess at my impatience till we meet, but I have so much  
 business appointed this next week that it is not possible for me  
 to stir from hence. The 17th of this month I intend to be in  
 town, and will presume I may find you there; if not, I shall  
 lament my own ill fortune, but acquitt you from any fault in it,  
 having made so kind an offer to me. Yours.

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (25).

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxiv., p. 166. Five days earlier Reresby  
 had dined and slept at Rufford, and had 'found his lordship more favour-  
 able than heretofore in relation to Court matters, but not thoroughly recon-  
 ciled, and very implacable to my Lord of Danby' (*Memoirs*, ed. 1875, p. 188).

1680 On September 3 Henry Savile, who had held a promise of the place for some weeks, was gazetted Vice-Chamberlain, and his brother thus congratulates him :—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>1</sup>

Rufford, Sept. <sup>6</sup>/<sub>10</sub>, '80.

You might think there are no good manners in the forest, if I did not send my own complements upon your late preferment,<sup>2</sup> which I hope may hereafter entitle you to something more substantial than this is in itself, and the next good news I hope to hear is that you have met with some man of ability to buy your other place;<sup>3</sup> in the mean time I thank you for staying till I come, which if I could do sooner than the next<sup>4</sup> week I should be very glad to prevent your complement, but it is not possible for me without an inconvenience greater than you can imagine. Yours.

Within a few days after writing this letter the Earl was actually in London.

'Lord Halifax came to town on Thursday,' writes Rachel Lady Russell to her husband, September 17,<sup>5</sup> and next morning his coach stood at Sir Thomas Chitchley's. The town says he is to hear all sides, and then choose wisely. He kissed the Duchess's hands last night; and she is gone this morning to tell the news at Newmarket<sup>6</sup> (whither the Court had migrated<sup>6</sup> the preceding day).

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxv., p. 167.

<sup>2</sup> He was sworn Vice-Chamberlain in place of Sir George Carteret, deceased, September 3 (Luttrell, i. 54).

<sup>3</sup> In the Bedchamber.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, 1819, p. 226.

<sup>5</sup> In the same letter she remarks, evidently in playful reference to Lord Russell's early courtship of Mistress Pierrepont, 'My sister Northumberland . . . says . . . that Lady Halifax has lost no beauty in the country, and takes particular care you may know it.'

<sup>6</sup> Luttrell, i. 55.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THE 'EXCLUSION' CONTEST OF 1680-81

'To hear all sides, and then choose wisely!' Lady Russell's conclusion reveals to us how successfully Lord Halifax, while preserving friendly relations with politicians of every shade, had maintained his attitude of reserve. Nor is other evidence wanting. 'I had,' writes William Coventry,<sup>1</sup> apparently about this period, 'a letter this day from L[ord] H[alifax] wherein hee seemes much satisfied w<sup>th</sup> his coming up at this time, and saith hee does not find but that the country party are *farre from being displeased either w<sup>th</sup> his coming up or going to Councell*.'<sup>2</sup> On the other side, we have the testimony of Henry Sidney, who, having arrived on leave from Holland, September 16, immediately called upon Lord Sunderland, in whose company he proceeded to Halifax House. The visitors found Lord Halifax 'in good-humour and willing to comply; he will' (adds Sidney) 'be a great help.' Three days later Sidney records again: 'My Lord Halifax was with me; he told me his designs and his opinion.'<sup>3</sup>

Septem-  
ber 1680.

• Into the details of these designs and these opinions the diplomatist does not enter, and circumstances to which we shall presently refer throw some uncertainty over his meaning. We are aware, however, from Sidney's own account of the Althorpe meeting, that Lord Halifax had undertaken to support the Ministers upon certain definite issues.

The programme thus accepted, and which represented, indeed, but the development of the Earl's own original

<sup>1</sup> To Sir Thomas Thynne, dated 'Sunday,' no month or year (*Tonguelet MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> Underlined in the original: 'since,' he adds, 'hee has made it his choice, I am glad it is soe & doe heartely wish he may find himselfe in the right, & that he may not take the civility of mens expressions (w<sup>h</sup> whome he speakes) for the sence of the party. . . .' Again (letter dated 'Monday noone'): 'I have since thought of L<sup>d</sup> H. & doe conclude one soe discerning as hee cannot (after warning) mistake soe farre his measures but rather that he sees some point upon w<sup>h</sup> to redintegrate himselfe. . . .'

<sup>3</sup> *Diary* (ed. Blencowe), ii. 106 7.



1080 policy, included, as we remember, the substitution of certain 'Limitations' for the Exclusion Bill; and, in Continental politics, a close alliance with the United Provinces. Meanwhile it is equally clear that Lord Halifax had no desire to break with the Moderates of the old Country party, whether favourably or unfavourably disposed to the existing Administration; and that he continued to cultivate the acquaintance of many who ranked with the extreme section. We infer that he hoped to rally the more reasonable members of all the political groups round a Government pledged to a moderate and patriotic policy.

The anticipations of Lord Halifax, however, are of the less moment because the situation which confronted him on his arrival in town contained elements as new as they were unexpected. So numerous were his channels of information, and so eagerly was his suffrage desired, that Lord Halifax cannot have been long in appreciating the facts of the case. Briefly, then, the policy of Lord Sunderland, with which Halifax had in June expressed his own concurrence, had undergone a complete, though not at this moment an avowed, transformation. In order to elucidate this point, we must revert to an earlier incident.

Some days after the Althorpe interview an attempt to indite the Duke of York<sup>1</sup> and the Duchess of Portsmouth<sup>2</sup> had revealed to the timorous mind of Sunderland the inherent strength and daring of the Exclusion party.<sup>3</sup> That interest had, in point of fact, gained enormously through the events of the preceding year. The general uneasiness—fostered, as we have seen, by the progress of events—had issued in a fever of enthusiasm for the measure which by its sweeping and definite character appealed with peculiar force to the ignorant and the zealous. Nor were these accessions of strength entirely derived from the ranks of political fanaticism; motives of prudence or conviction had drawn into the vortex of the popular movement a large proportion of those who had hitherto supported the Moderates. Lord Essex, for instance, had drifted

<sup>1</sup> As a Papist.

<sup>2</sup> As a national nuisance.

<sup>3</sup> Great stress is laid upon this episode in the news-letters of the day, since by this proceeding the Exclusion leaders had practically crossed the Rubicon, and rendered retreat impossible. Burnet mentions the incident in his letter of June 26: 'Your double uncle' (he tells Lord Halifax, who, as we remember, was in a twofold sense nephew by marriage to Lord Shaftesbury) 'has been very active.' Dorothy Lady Sunderland is equally impressed (letters appended to the *Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 348): 'I was told,' she adds, 'one of them said, "Oh, that we had my Lord Halifax!"'

with the prevalent tide. Sir William Temple,<sup>1</sup> while 1680 maintaining in public an attitude of complete neutrality, regarded the passage of the measure as a foregone conclusion; and saw in an entire surrender to the Parliamentary majority the only hope for a reconciliation between Court and people, the indispensable preliminary of a strong foreign policy. Henry Sidney, it is certain, had reached the same conclusion, and was soon occupied in a vigorous attack upon the scruples of the Prince of Orange. From such examples and such arguments wholesale conversions might be expected; and it is practically certain, moreover, that many who were in principle anti-Exclusionists shrank from incurring a futile odium for a cause which they regarded as lost.

Nor was this all. Within the straitest circle of the Court the defections had become numerous and alarming. Godolphin certainly seceded. The Duchess of Portsmouth, herself terrified by the attack of July, had hastened to propitiate 'The Faction' by espousing with fervour its cause. Nay, more; even the King himself, men whispered, had begun to waver. Relations between himself and his brother had not been invariably cordial; the influence of the Duchess was proverbial;<sup>2</sup> while the offers of the Exclusionist party, secretly made through her means, were munificent in the extreme. Six hundred thousand pounds and the right of naming a successor is a regal bribe indeed.<sup>3</sup>

Under these circumstances Lord Sunderland, who, as virtual Prime Minister during the twelve preceding months, anticipated a consensus of obloquy, determined to quit the sinking ship. Having opened secret negotiations, he effected a definite though private understanding with the Exclusionists, to whom he promised his active co-operation. The pretence of mystery, as we have seen, cannot long have imposed upon Lord Halifax, who was thus compelled to reconsider his own political position.

It is with no desire of trenching upon recent controversies that we point out how nearly his dilemma

<sup>1</sup> His *Memoirs* are rather disingenuous on this head, but even from them we gather that his intimacy with Sunderland was not affected by the conversion of the latter. Temple's real sentiments must be sought in his contemporary letters. (See Blencowe's *Sidney*, and Groen van Prinsterer.)

<sup>2</sup> Sunderland told Halifax she could do what she pleased with the King (The Halifax 'note book' at Devonshire House).

<sup>3</sup> See, for this extraordinary negotiation, Burnet, ii. 260-1; Dalrymple, i. 354; Groen van Prinsterer's *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 123; and H. Sidney to the Prince of Orange, October 7. Mutual distrust wrecked the project, but how far the King was serious cannot be known.

1680 coincides with the problem which, after Mr. Gladstone's conversion to the principle of Irish Home Rule, confronted the right wing of the English Liberal party; headed, it is curious to remember, by a descendant of Lord Halifax himself. The opinions of Lord Halifax upon the point at issue had never altered. He continued to assert,<sup>1</sup> in the first place, that the exclusion of the Duke of York must necessitate a Civil War, which, by the adoption of the 'Limitation' compromise, might be successfully and effectually averted. In the second place, he insisted<sup>2</sup> that the exclusion project would eventually undermine the reversionary interest of the Prince of Orange.

I. As regards the first point, there can be little difference of opinion. It is practically certain that, had the Exclusion Bill passed into law, the Duke of York, supported by a vigorous minority of Old Cavaliers and of *Jure Divino* Anglicans, would have raised the standard of revolt; nor is it possible to doubt that he would have had behind him, not only the finances of Louis XIV.,<sup>3</sup> but the political sanction of a Parliamentary majority both in Scotland and Ireland.<sup>4</sup> Eight or nine years later, when the criminal folly of James had alienated the most loyal, his deposition occasioned civil distractions in both the connected kingdoms; and his adherents, with those of his son and grandson, constituted for over fifty years a standing menace to the dynasty which eventually supplanted him. In 1680, as we believe, the struggle would have been the more equal, and therefore the more dubious, because the Exclusionists would have lacked the vast moral force which accrues to an attack upon existing as distinct from problematical evils; and James, while still in the prime of life and energy, was incapable of the panic-weakness which brought the contest of 1688 to so abrupt a conclusion.

On the other hand, at this stage in the controversy,

<sup>1</sup> See his speech during the Exclusion debate, quoted on a subsequent page.

<sup>2</sup> See his interview with the Dutch Ambassador, of which a report is given later on; and Barillon's admission, which we have given on p. 239, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> It is certain, from the despatches of Barillon, that to resist the Bill by force of arms was the deliberate though secret intention of the Duke of York, and that he was encouraged by Louis, whose emissaries intrigued simultaneously with King, Duke, and Opposition, in order to intensify those internal dissensions which should prevent England from taking an active part in Continental politics. (See Dalrymple, i. 343-347, 351.)

<sup>4</sup> The Scotch Parliament had retorted to the original Exclusion project by a declaration maintaining the unalterable character of the succession. Carte (iv. 580) well remarks how clearly this foreshadowed an eventual Civil War.

James himself was probably the only man in England, 1680 his co-religionists not excepted, who did not admit the desirability for some restriction of the Royal prerogative while in the hand of a Romanist. The Popish scare had electrified every section of society, and even the Papists themselves were eager to propitiate public opinion. The *Jure Divino* Anglicans, who regarded the Exclusion as the sin which hath never forgiveness, showed themselves even anxious for 'Limitations,' and, had the threat of exclusion been adroitly suspended, would doubtless have gone far in concession. The Royal assent, and with it the suffrage of the whole Court party, was assured beforehand; and upon this point Lord Halifax specially dilated. He 'assured me,' says Burnet,<sup>1</sup> 'that any limitations whatsoever that should leave the title of king to the duke, though it should be little more than a mere title, might be obtained of the king: but that he was positive and fixed against the exclusion.' The enemies of Lord Halifax, indeed, 'imputed' this obstinacy 'to his management,' and asserted 'that he had wrought the king' to a pitch of unwonted firmness. The truth or falseness of this allegation cannot, of course, be determined; we have seen that Charles had been credited with at least a momentary hesitation; but it is clear that, on the whole, he displayed throughout the crisis a very unexpected decision. This at least appears probable, that had the Exclusionists concurred in the proposed compromise, James II. would have succeeded, in due time, to a purely titular sovereignty. Hence the mortal hatred which James entertained for the Limitation project, even as contrasted with the Bill of Exclusion. The one scheme threatened to deprive him of a crown; the other, while practically effecting the same object, threatened to deprive him of the means wherewith to regain his authority.

II. The second issue, which relates to the interest of the House of Orange, is of a somewhat more complicated character. It is evident, that by the ostensible terms of the Exclusion Bill, as eventually drafted,<sup>2</sup> the position of the Prince was rather improved than threatened; since, had the Bill become law, his wife's reversion would have been no longer postponed to her father's. This argument had strongly influenced the more recent Ministerial seceders, who, moreover, as we have seen, aimed at converting the Prince to their opinion. According to these

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 249, *ed.* 1833.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix to this chapter.

1680 men, the pretensions of the Duke of Monmouth were purely chimerical; and we frankly admit that in the House of Commons his avowed adherents did not exceed a dozen.<sup>1</sup> But this view of the matter excludes certain considerations, which were vividly present to the minds both of Lord Halifax and of Lord Shaftesbury. The real strength of the young Duke lay in the fact that among the more ardent Exclusionists hatred of York was the predominant motive, and the question as to who should replace him appeared a matter of comparative indifference.<sup>2</sup> It is more than probable—first, that Charles, if driven to bay, would have preferred his son to his nephew; secondly, that the pretensions of the Duke of Monmouth, if advanced as a condition of the Royal assent, would have secured a majority in their favour; thirdly, that such a solution would have excited the enthusiasm of the populace, to whom the Prince of Orange was but a name.

Nor can we ignore the fact that, apart from political reasons, more intimate motives have been adduced for the apparent consistency of our statesman. Among these, a few carry their own refutation with them. The circumstances of the Althorpe interview effectually dispose of the legend that Lord Halifax was actuated by jealousy of Lord Sunderland and by the desire to supplant him—a suggestion which probably emanates from Sunderland himself.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 436 (letter from Godolphin); Dalrymple, i. 355 (Barillon). Of these men, Armstrong, Montague, and Mr. Thynne (of Longleat) were chief. Halifax includes Essex and Capel in the party (Devonshire House 'note book').

<sup>2</sup> Thus even Shaftesbury, while advocating in general the pretensions of Monmouth, was clearly ready to sacrifice these pretensions in favour of any scheme which might appear more practicable, as the King's divorce. Russell, on the other hand, who obviously inclined to the Prince of Orange, is mentioned as one of those engaged in the 'Portsmouth' intrigue, which certainly pointed towards the Duke of Monmouth or one of his half-brothers. The Republicans, such as Algernon Sidney, would probably have thrown their weight into the same scale. The *Discourses* of Algernon Sidney, though never published till 1698, were written, to judge from internal evidence, between the beginning of 1682 and his arrest in June 1683, and constitute a direct attack on the principle of hereditary monarchy. Though nominally an answer to Filmer, we may conclude that they were written with reference to the Exclusion debate. Sidney refers more than once to the fact that bastards had been raised to the English throne, and loses no opportunity of reflecting on the *succession of women* or of extolling the Salic law. This seems significant. 'Il n'est pas aisé,' wrote Barillon, September 3, 'de trouver sur ce la un tempérament qui puisse satisfaire les deux partis. . . . M. de Monmouth croit que la prétention peut le restablir' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xv., part 2, p. 68). (See also Dalrymple, i. 348.)

<sup>3</sup> With whom Temple, from whose *Memoirs* we derive it, was so particularly intimate; nor does it appear credible that Halifax, whose ambition was

Vanity, with the desire of parading his powers and his importance, have been freely attributed by others;<sup>1</sup> but 1680 Halifax himself disclaims<sup>2</sup> the spirit of the political volunteer who leads a forlorn hope from sheer love of bravado. Burnet may be nearer the truth when he tells us that 'lord Halifax's hatred of the earl of Shaftesbury,<sup>3</sup> . . . sharpened him at that time to much indecency in his whole deportment.'<sup>4</sup> From the humiliation of political surrender the pride of Halifax, we may be certain, revolted; and resentment, no doubt, gave energy to the impulse of political conviction.

On the other hand, it is but fair to allow that in the case of Halifax, as in that of Lord Sunderland, the argument of personal safety weighs heavily on the popular side. The trend of political passion could not be ignored; the seriousness of the risks which an attempt to contravene it must involve were equally apparent;<sup>5</sup> 'hee's a stout man' (writes a contemporary) 'that dare offer a negative first.'<sup>6</sup> The attitude of propitiation again seemed peculiarly appropriate to Lord Halifax. He knew—none better, for it was the constant theme of his friends—how sullen and bitter a resentment had been elicited throughout Exclusionist circles by his share in the acts of the Triumvirate. Nor could he fail to perceive that, while the power and animus of the party had increased to so enormous an extent, the defection of Sunderland and Essex must leave him, in case of recusancy, the sole target of political vengeance. His long and intimate connection with the Country party, whercof the Exclusionists had now captured a majority, only aggravated the perils of the prospect; since the fate of his grand-uncle Strafford

strongly tempered by prudence, should have schemed at this moment for a Ministerial pre-eminence which must have insured to him the reversion of Lord Sunderland's unpopularity, and which the uncertain temper of Charles must have rendered as precarious as invidious.

<sup>1</sup> As Burnet (see below); and Barillon, in *Christie*, ii. 76, November 18. Barillon's conclusion seems vitiated by the absolutely erroneous premise—namely, that all parties had treated Halifax with invidious neglect; and a few days later Barillon himself admits: 'He' (Halifax) 'is entirely in the interest of the Prince of Orange, and what he seems to be doing for the Duke of York is really in order to make an opening for a compromise by which the Prince of Orange may benefit' (*ibid.* November 23).

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Henry Savile of January 6 (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 173).

<sup>3</sup> 'and his vanity in desiring to have his own notion preferred.'

<sup>4</sup> Vol. ii. p. 250, ed. 1833.

<sup>5</sup> An impeachment for high treason, even if, as in the case of Danby and some of the Papist prisoners, no trial actually took place, might involve a preliminary imprisonment of years.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, p. 173.

1680 might have recalled the political commonplace—of which Lord Halifax, as we think, had scarcely realised the force—that no hatred is so intense as that evoked by a reputed renegade.

The way of repentance, moreover, lay invitingly open. His protracted absence from the political scene tended to cast over any possible change of front the halo of calm reconsideration. Innumerable examples, as we have already seen, authorised a conversion—which was certain to be accepted as full atonement for all his political sins. These arguments seem to have been urged by friends, the exact tenor of whose counsels does not transpire, but who appear to have advised that Lord Halifax should, in some manner compatible with political decency, decline a contest which they regarded as desperate.

The cogency of such reflections was, of course, realised with peculiar distinctness by the Exclusionists themselves; and we imagine that they entertained little doubt of an ultimate recantation. There seems particular reason to suppose that Lord Sunderland felt secure upon the point; since Temple insinuates, and probably upon his authority, that Lord Halifax, after long vacillation, reverted at the last moment, from purely interested motives. A similar interpretation may be laid to the credit of Henry Sidney;<sup>1</sup> and while the opposite party strained every nerve to secure it,<sup>2</sup> even the Duke of York himself seems to have despaired of the statesman's suffrage. In point of fact, Lord Halifax, even after the opening of the session, preserved a somewhat delusive reticence; and as regards minor issues continued to co-operate both at Council and in Parliament with all sections of the Country party. In reality, however, his determination was practically taken, as appears from the following valuable letter, written<sup>3</sup> three weeks after his arrival in town and a fortnight before the opening of Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> See his rather ambiguous observations recorded at the beginning of this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> See the following passage from the *Secret Dutch Despatch* of October 5: 'Men proceed daily in the endeavour to bring over to the King's side before the advent of the impending Parliament, some Lords who for a considerable time have held aloof from the court, & no doubt is felt but that the Earls of Essex, Halifax, & Russell will shortly resume their share in the direction of affairs.' The despatch adds that even Shaftesbury and Monmouth are mentioned in this connection (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888, f. 343).

<sup>3</sup> After an interview with Sunderland at Henry Sidney's (*Diary*, Blencowe's edition, ii. p. 108; no particulars are given).

*The Earl of Halifax to Sir Thomas Thynne.*<sup>1</sup>Oct : 5. 80.<sup>2</sup>

This will find you returned to Draydon, where you are so great a stranger, that you ought to forfeit it for Non residence, and now that the P<sup>th</sup> sitteth,<sup>3</sup> you are likely to leave it againe for a good while, which I am very glad of for my own sake, since I am for the winter settled in town againe. I beleve that though I found at my arrivall a new Scene in State matters, yet it is the same as when you left the town, so that I shall not be able to give any information that is new to you, but I confesse I was a little surprised to see such a change in some of the Court in relation to the Duke : I am told there is now as much anger against him at Whitehall as there can bee at the other end of the town, so industrious his Highnesse hath been to spoyle his own businesse ; <sup>4</sup> the waves beat so high against him, that great part of the world will not hear of any thing lesse than exclusion ; for my own part I neither am nor will bee under any obligations that might restraine the freedome of my opinion concerning him ; but yet if there is any possibility of making ourselves safe by lower expedients, I had rather use them, than venture upon so strong a remedy, as the disinheriting the next heire of the Crown : Upon this occasion I have been thinking what is proper for a friend to advise you as to your own particular. If you do not come at the very first sitting, the country party will bee angry and perhaps treat you as roughly as they have done some of your friends ; If you do come, in all probability the first businesse will bee to proceed against the Duke, and if you have the same tendernesse you used to have in point of decency towards him,<sup>5</sup> you will bee in great difficulties to know how to behave your selfe : for my own sake I wish you here for a thousand reasons, but as things are, I do not know, whether it may not bee adviseable for you, to hearken a little for a week or 10 dayes, whilst the P<sup>th</sup> sitteth, after their method of proceeding, and upon that forme your resolutions of coming up, and though others may do it better, I shall not omitt to give you the best lights I can ; presuming upon the safety of this conveyance by the Carrier of Colshill.<sup>6</sup> in the meantime I can tell you, the Town sayeth as confidently the K. will quit his brother, as those of his<sup>7</sup> party say the contrary : a fine world, and a happy prospect of things when our remedies are little lesse to be feared, than our disease ; I am

Dear S<sup>r</sup> for ever Yours.<sup>8</sup><sup>1</sup> *Tongleat MSS.*      <sup>2</sup> Addressed 'For S<sup>r</sup> Thomas Thynne at Drayton.'<sup>3</sup> I.e. is about to sit.<sup>4</sup> This probably refers to the fact that he had quarrelled with the Duchess of Portsmouth.<sup>5</sup> I.e. having been in his service.<sup>6</sup> He means that he could not have written so freely if his letter had been intended to go by the post, which was liable to official interference.<sup>7</sup> The Duke's.      <sup>8</sup> Unsigned ; seal, an antique head.



1680 At the very moment, however, when Lord Halifax thus defined his political bias, public uncertainty as to his intentions was increased by his sympathy with the Exclusionists on a connected though subordinate issue. He had resumed, as we have already seen, his attendance at the Council board; and here he anticipated Exclusionists, both secret and avowed, in urging the withdrawal of the Duke of York, before the meeting of Parliament,<sup>1</sup> from the political scene. The Duke's resentment may be imagined; he drew the most obvious inference,<sup>2</sup> and in his expostulations with Charles he gave free vent to his irritation. Lord Halifax he stigmatised as 'an Atheist,' who 'had no bowels,' and had 'hitherto been no good friend to Monarchy;' while his suspicions with regard to Lord Sunderland coincided with the actual truth.<sup>3</sup> His remonstrances, however, were futile: on October 20 he left, under protest, for Scotland, and the next day beheld the long-expected opening of Parliament.

The King, in a brief speech, dilated upon the alliance with Spain, the first-fruits of a popular foreign policy. He urged a further investigation of 'The Plot,' and dwelt upon his financial necessities, especially with regard to Tangier. He promised such securities for the Protestant religion as might consist with 'preserving the Succession

<sup>1</sup> The progress of this affair may be traced in Macpherson's *Extracts* (i. 104-5). Lord Halifax, during the absence of the Court, which had gone to Newmarket shortly before his own arrival in town, suggested to Sunderland and Godolphin, in his capacity of Privy Counsellor, the propriety of the Duke's retreat. The two, together with Lord Essex, entered warmly into the project. The rumour escaped. James, during a visit of Sunderland and Godolphin to Newmarket, questioned them on the matter, and was met with a prompt denial. His suspicions were justified when on October 10, the day after the King's return to town, they broached the matter to his Majesty. He refused his concurrence, and on the 11th they applied to the Duke himself, who bitterly resented their previous duplicity. In consequence of the Duke's remonstrance Charles referred the matter to the whole Council (October 12 and 13), which decided that the Duke should remain. But on the 16th, under pressure from Sunderland, in whose sincerity he yet believed, Charles called an extraordinary Council, and announced his decision that the Duke should retire. (See also H. Sidney and *Dutch Despatches*.)

<sup>2</sup> Temple, on the other hand, merely remarks that Halifax was glad to make fair weather with the majority before the session by his opposition to the Duke.

<sup>3</sup> Sunderland, he said, was governed by his 'three uncles' (Shaftesbury and the Sidneys), and he described the principles of Essex (who held the theory of the original contract) as notorious, together with the reconciliation recently made between that nobleman and Shaftesbury. 'The Ministers,' say the *Dutch Despatches* (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. SSS, f. 347, October 15), 'begin to think of their own interest, and, where possible, to coalesce with their opponents, to which end many secret conferences are being held at untimely hours.' (See also Henry Sidney, [Blencowe, ii. 113].)

of the Crown in its due and legal Course of Descent,' and exhorted, in moving terms, to political concord. 1680

The House of Lords immediately resumed its inquiry into the progress of the Popish plot; Lord Halifax, who still ranked with the Country party,<sup>1</sup> took an active share in the business, and seems to have championed an intemperate Bill, framed to drive the Papists from London, which passed the Upper House, but dropped, very fortunately, with the prorogation.<sup>2</sup>

Upon this measure Algernon Sidney animadverts in a letter to Henry Savile<sup>3</sup> which shows how completely the events of the preceding year had alienated Halifax and Sidney. 'The Lord Halifax,' he says, 'brought in a bill for the speedy discovery and conviction of Papists, and ease of Nonconformists,'<sup>4</sup> but so contrived, that both parties are almost equally incensed against him for it. The house of Lords was on Thursday turned into a Committee, and, as I hear, will be so every day, to consider of it, and try whether it can be so mended, as to be useful unto the ends intended. I know not whether that can be done or no; but I could have wished, that intending to oblige above a Million of men, that go under the name of Nonconformists, he had been pleased to consult with one of that number,' concerning the ways of doing it.'

To his brother meanwhile Lord Halifax himself wrote as follows, in reply to a letter which is not now extant:—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>5</sup>*

Nov. 11, '80.

• My daughter Betty having yet no galant to employ in her service,<sup>7</sup> her father must supply that place in answering your civilities, which I assure you are very well received, and have gone very far towards your supplanting mee in her good opinion. Y<sup>r</sup> nephew will probably be gone towards Italy before this

<sup>1</sup> He was introduced under his new title by Lords Essex and Salisbury, both of whom voted for the Exclusion. Halifax himself sat on the Committees appointed to examine into recent changes in the Commission of the Peace, and to consider the Irish Cattle Bill, both of which Committees were almost entirely recruited from the ranks of the Exclusionists.

<sup>2</sup> Re-introduced October 23; committed October 25; Halifax reported October 26 and 27, Lord Bridgewater October 29; referred to a Select Committee; it passed November 10. Its provisions, which were extremely tyrannical, may be studied in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, pp. 105, 130, 159.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, p. 164, October 30.

<sup>4</sup> Clause xiv. (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, p. 108).

<sup>5</sup> Sidney himself (?).

<sup>6</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxvi., p. 168.

<sup>7</sup> She must have been about five years old.

1680 reacheth you, and I hope he hath carry'd y<sup>r</sup> advice along with him, to think upon as he goeth. I have renew'd my leave to him to dispose of himself as he is most inclined, and I am apt to believe the inconveniences of such a journey at this time of year may help to tame his roving fancy, and for the time to come make him love home the better for it. My L<sup>d</sup> Newcastle<sup>1</sup> hath this day lost my L<sup>d</sup> Ogle,<sup>2</sup> after a sickness of three weeks; I believe him of all men living at this time the most to be pitied, his thoughts being so very much fixed upon making his family great, and by this sudden blow all his hopes are irrecoverably blasted. The journals of par<sup>t</sup> and all other news being sent to you by virtue of your character,<sup>3</sup> I need not repeat them. You may think there is no great progress made yet in publick matters but the necessary methods at the first sitting of a par<sup>t</sup> make things go slower than they would do otherwise. I am interrupted, and can only tell you I am ever yours.

Meanwhile the House of Commons, under the energetic guidance of Lord Russell and Sir William Jones,<sup>4</sup> had endorsed, with enthusiastic precipitation, the principle of exclusion.<sup>5</sup> The former, a man of moderate gifts, a reluctant and an indifferent speaker, commanded, by sheer force of sincerity, courage, and modesty, the enthusiastic devotion reserved as a rule for more brilliant attractions.<sup>6</sup> The high legal reputation of Jones (at one time Attorney-General) gave to his sanction, on the other hand, a peculiar importance and value; while the notorious timidity of his character reassured the scrupulous and the wavering.<sup>7</sup> By November 8 the Exclusion Bill was in Committee, and rumour began to insist that the King would eventually yield.

That evening, so we learn, the King held a meeting of Council. Time, it was felt, now pressed; nor was it longer possible to ignore the reports of impending concession. The moment for reserve had passed, and it seems to have been on this crucial occasion that both Halifax

<sup>1</sup> His brother-in-law, the 'Lord Ogle' of Savile's youth, now Duke of Newcastle.

<sup>2</sup> His only son.

<sup>3</sup> Official position.

<sup>4</sup> Temple's *Works*, ii. 532.

<sup>5</sup> A vote in this sense passed October 26. The first reading took place November 3; it was read a second time and committed on November 6.

<sup>6</sup> He was, says one who had known him in society, a man 'for whom of all men I have known, one would have been the most willing to have died' (*Letters of Lady Russell*, 1819, p. 49). See Christie (ii. 371) for a curious instance of his political fanaticism—his desire, despite Shaftesbury's disapprobation, to impeach the Duke of York, in hopes of a capital sentence.

<sup>7</sup> We have seen that as late as the preceding summer Jones and Halifax had corresponded. All intercourse with Russell on the part of Halifax had probably ceased for some time on account of the intimate relations which existed between Russell and Shaftesbury.

and Sunderland unmasked.<sup>1</sup> The adhesion of Lord 1680  
Halifax more than compensated for the defection of the  
supple official; the King, at his instance, displayed un-  
usual vigour, and repeated, in presence of the House of  
Commons, his unalterable determination to maintain the  
rights of his brother. As regards the immediate upshot,  
this move was quite ineffectual; and three days later, by  
an overwhelming majority, the Bill of Exclusion passed  
the House of Commons.

The rumour that Halifax had announced his own  
intended opposition spread, as we can imagine, like wild-  
fire; and a mysterious lull in the proceedings, with the  
four days' interval which it occasioned,<sup>2</sup> was utilised by  
the leaders of the Exclusionist party for an attempt to  
coerce the recalcitrant politician. ['I got'] says Burnet,  
'many meetings [to be] appointed' between lord Halifax  
and some leading men; in which as he tried to divert  
them from the exclusion, so they studied to persuade him  
to it, both without effect.' The arguments of the Exclu-  
sionists, as we gather, partook of a forcible character. 'I  
am full of my Lord Halifax,' writes Dorothy Lady Sunder-  
land,<sup>3</sup> who espoused, with enthusiasm, her son-in-law's  
interest, 'and will tell what perhaps nobody else will,-  
that, a day or two before the Duke's bill was carried to  
the Lords, one of the great actors came to him [,] as a  
friend, I suppose, to tell him if he did speak against it he  
would be impeached by the House of Commons, or an  
address made to the King to remove him from his great  
place' of Privy Counsellor; he answered, neither threaten-  
ings nor promises should hinder him from speaking his  
mind.<sup>4</sup> . . . In a point, he says, he has studied more  
than ever he did any, and would have been glad if he  
could have gone the popular and safe way.'

The futility of these negotiations therefore soon  
became evident; and on the morning of November 15  
the impatience of Russell,<sup>5</sup> to whom the Bill had been

<sup>1</sup> Clarke's *Life of James II.*, i. 614; Macpherson's *Original Extracts*, p. 107.  
Sunderland had spoken pretty openly for nearly three weeks (Burnet, ii. 249).

<sup>2</sup> Some ascribed this to the desire of allowing time for the presentation  
to the King (November 12) of certain petitions from the City in favour of  
the Exclusion Bill.

<sup>3</sup> The passages in brackets were suppressed in the earliest editions  
(which read: 'Many meetings were appointed'), and will be found in the  
edition of 1833 (ii. 250, note).

<sup>4</sup> To Henry Sidney, December 19 (Blencowe, ii. 127).

<sup>5</sup> This seems to be sarcastic. Lord Halifax, we remember, held no office.

<sup>6</sup> 'How he did it, you who know may judge.'

<sup>7</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 616.

1680 entrusted, precipitated the final issue.<sup>1</sup> Snatching the parchment from the table of the House of Commons, he hastened towards the House of Lords, a confused throng of supporters streaming after him. And as (his somewhat heavy features aglow, no doubt, with the almost fanatical enthusiasm of the moment) he read aloud to their lordships the ominous title of the Bill, a shout of applause arose from the press behind. An attempt to adjourn the House, which was initiated by the Exclusionist Peers, met with defeat at the hands of the Courtiers, and the House went at once into Committee for the purposes of freer discussion.

Then ensued a scene, the most striking, perhaps, of a by no means inanimate period. The debate became an oratorical duel between the two finest speakers of their own generation. Bound by the ties of affinity and of long political association--alienated by recent animosities and jealousies which had long reached their height, the two champions, for the greater part of seven hours, in presence of the King and of the representatives of the people, surging behind the bar, debated the succession to the imperial crown of England. Lord Shaftesbury displayed to the full his extraordinary oratorical powers; but, by the consent of friends and foes alike, Lord Halifax surpassed him. 'Shaftesbury,' writes a contemporary, 'was never so outdone before.' 'Lord Halifax,' says Barillon, 'stood up to Lord Shaftesbury, and answered him every time he spoke.'<sup>2</sup> 'He gained,' records Burnet, 'great honour in the debate; and had a visible superiority to lord Shaftesbury in the opinion of the whole house: and that was to him triumph enough.'<sup>3</sup> 'Halifax,' observes James II., no doubt upon the authority of men who had been actually present, 'spoke incomparably, and bore the burden of the day in the committee. He answered Shaftesbury and Essex, as oft as they spoke. He spoke, at least, sixteen times, letting slip no good occasion. His reasons were so strong, that they convinced every body that was not resolved not to hear.'<sup>4</sup>

'Of powerful eloquence,' remarks Peterborough, one

<sup>1</sup> An inclination appeared in some quarters to postpone yet further the event, on the plea that fresh evidence forthcoming implicated the Duke of York in the Popish Plot.

<sup>2</sup> Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 375. I do not know on what Mr. Christie founds his rather depreciatory opinion of Halifax as a speaker: 'rather an able, witty, and ingenious dialectician than a moving orator' (article in the *Saturday Review*, February 22, 1873).

<sup>3</sup> *History*, edit. 1833, ii. 252.

<sup>4</sup> Macpherson's *Original Papers*, i. 108.

of the Duke's adherents,<sup>1</sup> 'and great parts were the Duke's enemies who did assert the Bill; but a noble Lord appeared against it, who, that day, in all the force of speech, in reason, in arguments of what could concern the public or the private interests of men, in honour, in conscience, in estate, did out do himself and every other man.' 'Old men,' declares Macaulay,<sup>2</sup> 'who lived to admire the eloquence of Pulteney in its meridian, and that of Pitt in its splendid dawn, still murmured that they had heard nothing like the great speeches of Lord Halifax on the Exclusion Bill.'

Of this magnificent effort three details alone are preserved. Lord Halifax seems to have reflected severely on the Duke of Monmouth<sup>3</sup> (who had supported the Bill in a somewhat unctuous speech<sup>4</sup>); he expressed confidence in his own capacity to supersede the Exclusion Bill by a practical scheme of 'Limitations';<sup>5</sup> and he enlarged on the peril of Civil War in a passage which, as an appeal to terror, was bitterly resented by the fanatics of the Lower House.<sup>6</sup> Upon this topic the speaker urged<sup>7</sup> 'How imprudent '(a thing) 'it would be to declare the Duke an enemy to the State, who was actually at the head of a powerfull Nation, where there was an Army too; that in Ireland his power was no less considerable where there was 10, or 15 Papists for one Protestant, that he had great interest in the Fleet and credit with the English Troops.'

The arguments of Lord Halifax proved as effective as they were skilful; and while the day wore on, it became abundantly evident that his eloquence was gaining a distinct and increasing ascendancy over the mind of the House. The debate grew additionally acrimonious; passion rose to fever heat, and the Exclusionists began to regard their supreme antagonist with a hatred almost diabolically intense. In the enthusiasm of the moment Lord Peterborough, as it happened, laid his hand, by an illustrative gesture, upon the hilt of his sword. An

<sup>1</sup> This passage is quoted from a note to Macaulay's *History* (i. 259, edit. 1858). It is there given from a work called *Succinct Genealogies*, by Robert Halstead, which was, so Macaulay informs us, written by Peterborough and his chaplain.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays*, 5th edit. iii. 84 (essay on Sir William Temple). We have not been able to recover Macaulay's authority for the statement.

<sup>3</sup> Macpherson's *Original Papers*, i. 109. But he did not mention his uncle. (See Barillon.)

<sup>4</sup> 'Barillon says that he did not speak ill' (Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 376).

<sup>5</sup> Speeches of Vernon and Harbord in the debate of November 17, given further on. (See pp. 252, 254.)

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 252, 255.

<sup>7</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 621 (from contemporary letters).

1680 instant of wild confusion followed, and it seemed, for a few seconds, as if a debate at the sword's point immediately impended. In the midst of the turmoil several of the more violent Exclusionists (including, as he boasted in later years, Lord Winchester, a former friend) closed upon Lord Halifax, 'being resolved,' as Lord Winchester puts it, 'to *make sure of him*, in case any violence had been offered.'<sup>1</sup>

The danger of an absolute collision was, however, fortunately averted, and the sitting reached a different and less bloody conclusion. Seldom perhaps is the upshot of debate effected, even by the most splendid displays of Parliamentary rhetoric. But the number of waverers was on this occasion unusually large; and when, at a very late hour the same evening,<sup>2</sup> the Exclusion Bill was *rejected* on the first reading<sup>3</sup> by a majority of thirty-three,<sup>4</sup> public opinion almost unanimously ascribed the result to Lord Halifax. 'He made,' says Reresby, 'so fine and so powerful a defence, that he alone (for so all confessed) persuaded the whole House against it.' 'His conduct and his parts were both victorious,' says Lord Peterborough, 'and by him all the wit and malice of that party was over-thrown.' 'At present,' wrote Sunderland's wife to Henry Sidney, 'Lord Halifax is the King's favorite, and hated more than ever the Lord Treasurer<sup>5</sup> was, and has really deserved it. For he has undone all.'<sup>6</sup> The fury of the Exclusionists is indeed the best evidence of their conviction; it was the fury of men foiled in the moment of apparent victory.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Dartmouth (notes to Burnet, edit. 1833, i. 36) gives this story as one which he had heard Lord Winchester, when Duke of Bolton, tell of himself 'before a great deal of company.'

<sup>2</sup> James II. says at nine (Macpherson's *Original Papers*, i. 108); Baillon (Christie's *Shufflesbury*, ii. 377) and the *Aylesbury Memoirs* say at eleven.

<sup>3</sup> Such was the wish of Charles. Lord Essex, at the Council of November 8, had suggested that if Charles were unalterably opposed to the Bill, of which he expressed his own approbation, it might be so amended in Committee of the Upper House as to assume the proportions of a Limitation Bill; but Charles had negatived this proposal (Macpherson, *Extracts*, p. 107).

<sup>4</sup> The numbers were 63—30.

<sup>5</sup> *Memoirs*, edit. 1875, p. 190.

<sup>6</sup> On November 16, within twenty-four hours of the debate (Blencowe's *Sidney*, ii. 125).

<sup>7</sup> Lord Danby.

<sup>8</sup> See also *Abraham and Achitophel*, line 886, where it is said that 'Jotham' (Halifax) having chosen the better side, 'turned the balance too, So much the weight of one brave man can do.' Burnet makes no assertion on the point. Temple, on the other hand, maintains that there would have been in any case a majority against the Bill. Temple, however, is exceedingly inaccurate at this stage. He estimates the minority at seventeen. Now twenty-five Peers actually protested against the rejection (*Lords' Journals*).

That Lord Halifax himself appreciated the peril of his political situation appears from the following letter to his brother, which bears the date of this momentous day :—

• *The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>1</sup>

Nov. 15, '80.

I am desired by my very good friend the Dean of Canterbury<sup>2</sup> to recommend this gentleman Mr Nelson to your kind reception, which, as you give it by y<sup>r</sup> place to every man that speaketh English, so I am sure you will not refuse to do it something more particularly to him, that he may joyn with all our other travellers in your praises, for an affable minister. Our world here is so heated that you must not be surprised though you should hear I am in the disfavour of those from whom I never yet deserved ill: if innocence can be a protection, you need never be in pain for me, and so I kiss your hands.

We have now to inquire, in the first place, after what fashion the Exclusion party in the Commons evinced its resentment; and, secondly, by what means Lord Halifax proposed to supply the place of the rejected measure. The latter topic claims precedence in point of time, for upon the morning<sup>3</sup> which followed the crucial debate the Commons met only for an ostentatious adjournment, the dramatic evidence of their political despair.

The House of Lords, on the contrary, went again into Committee, in order 'to consider of heads for the effectual securing of the Protestant Religion;' that is, in other words, in order to discover some political expedient which might replace the policy of Exclusion. The discussion appears to have been lively in the extreme. Lord Shaftesbury<sup>4</sup> proposed the King's divorce and re-marriage, with the singular rider that he believed no one desired to interfere with the legitimate line of succession, if such interference could be avoided.

Lord Halifax (proceeds Barillon<sup>5</sup>), wishing to undo the effect of what had been proposed by Lord Shaftesbury about the exclusion of the Duke of York and the divorce, said that all these proposals were based only on private interests, and had no object but to bring about the success of unjust and chimerical pretensions. He said much else which could only apply to the Duke of Monmouth, and he added that there were more secret

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxvii., p. 168.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Tillotson.

<sup>3</sup> November 16.

<sup>4</sup> So Barillon (*Christie*, ii. 379). Burnet and James II. (*Macpherson*, i. 108) say Halifax opened the debate; but Barillon wrote on the spot.

<sup>5</sup> Despatch of November 23 (*Christie*, ii. 379).



1680 and dangerous designs, and insinuated, without naming the Duchess of Portsmouth, that she had views for her son,<sup>1</sup> and that she had hopes also for herself,<sup>2</sup> and that it was these designs which made her shake the whole machine.

Lord Shaftesbury, impatient at such a speech, told Lord Halifax that he of course did not believe that the Duke of York was a Catholic, since he combated with such warmth the reasonable precaution, which the nation desired to take against him.

To this Lord Halifax replied: 'I know that the Duke of York is a Roman Catholic; and I am one of the first who knew it, and I feared the consequences of it at the time when that Lord, who has interrupted me, affixed the seal to a declaration for establishing liberty of conscience in favour of Papists, and at the time also when that Lord was working with zeal and with success for the rupture of the Triple Alliance.'

'This answer,' adds Barillon, 'much disconcerted Lord Shaftesbury, who did not give up pressing his point and supporting his proposals as vehemently as before.'

On his own part Lord Halifax proposed the banishment of the Duke to a distance of 500 miles from England, either for a period coëxtensive with the King's life<sup>3</sup> or for an express term of five years.<sup>4</sup> This very despotic suggestion met with ridicule at the hands of the Exclusionists, and was, as we should have expected, coldly received by the Duke's partisans. The biographer of James<sup>5</sup> hints that it was not very seriously intended, and we may perhaps dismiss it as a piece of bravado, designed to show how little the speaker was actuated by regard for the interests of the Duke. On James himself, who received intelligence of the two debates on the same day, the incident naturally made a very disagreeable impression,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This was the case. She hoped, if Charles should obtain the right of naming his successor, to secure his decision in favour of her son, the Duke of Richmond.

<sup>2</sup> Can this mean that she expected Charles should marry her in the event of a divorce?

<sup>3</sup> So Burnet (ii. 258) and James II. (Macpherson, i. 108). The expression of the Duke's biographer that the banishment was to be life-long is evidently founded on a misapprehension of the passage quoted by Macpherson.

<sup>4</sup> So Barillon (Christie, ii. 378). <sup>5</sup> Clarke's *Life of James II.*, i. 619.

<sup>6</sup> 'It was,' he wrote to his friend George Legge, 'as bad as a stab with a dagger to me to hear, after Lord Halifax had spoke so handsomely for me, and managed the whole debate, he should make such a proposition as he did the next day, what shall I say to it. I would willingly not be thought of of (? as) not being very sensible of kindnesses done me, and I am as sensible as possible of his doing his part so very well at the rejecting of my bill, but can I or any-body think him really my friend, that would have me banished from his Majesty's presence, for he moved it, so that I am in a strait as to him, and know not almost what to do, and to say the truth

though he prevailed upon himself to write Lord Halifax, 1680 the same night, a civil letter.<sup>1</sup>

Another proposal, made by Lord Essex, was, however, endorsed by the Committee.<sup>2</sup> 'He moved,' says Burnet,<sup>3</sup> 'that an association should be entered into<sup>4</sup> to maintain those expedients, and that some cautionary towns should be put into the hands of the associators during the king's life to make them<sup>5</sup> good after his death. The king looked on this as a deposing of himself . . . and . . . worse than the exclusion.' The invidiousness of this particular suggestion could not escape the penetration of Lord Halifax, and he frequently observed to Dr. Burnet that 'this whole management looked like a design to unite the king more entirely to the duke, instead of separating him from him: the king came to think that he himself was levelled at chiefly, though for decency's sake his brother was only named.'<sup>6</sup>

The action of the Commons meanwhile was anticipated with considerable anxiety; for since their proceedings, during the intervals of the exclusion debates, had been marked by extreme violence against 'abhorrrers,' against such as had ridiculed the Plot revelations, and against other obnoxious persons,<sup>7</sup> it was scarcely to be hoped that they should endure with equanimity this very unexpected reverse.

The question was not long in suspense. On the 17th - forty-eight hours, that is, after the decisive debate in the Upper Chamber—the business of supplies for Tangier became the order of the day in the Commons. The Duke happened to be admiral for Tangier, and this circumstance, during the course of an acrimonious discussion, afforded a far-fetched pretext for intelligible if irrelevant allusions to the defeat of the Exclusion. Men spoke of arguments in the Lords' House which had insinuated the

what I hear they are agoing on with in the House of Lords, will be of as bad consequence if not worse to me, and much worse for the monarchy, then the bill that was thrown out' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 53 [Dartmouth papers, November 22, 1680].)

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *Lords' Journal.*

<sup>3</sup> Edit. 1833, vol. ii. pp. 258-9.

<sup>4</sup> According to precedent (*temp.* Edward III. and Elizabeth).

<sup>5</sup> The expedients.

<sup>6</sup> The Committee further resolved on this occasion that the Duke should be disabled from sitting in Parliament or acting as admiral in foreign waters.

<sup>7</sup> Ralph, whom no one will suspect of partiality for the prerogative lawyers, says (i. 516): 'It cannot, however, be deny'd, but that the Judges could not possibly commit greater Trespasses on the Liberty of the Subject, in support of the Prerogative, than this House of Commons did in support of their Privileges.'

1680 power of the Duke beyond the Border ; while succeeding speakers reflected in general terms upon ' Evil Counsellors ' and such as made ' a difference between the Houses.' These ominous mutterings foretold the storm which the friends of Halifax had so long apprehended, and scarcely was the question of Supply postponed in favour of an ' Address on the State of the Nation' ere Ralph Montague rose in his place.

It was not for want of zeal (he began<sup>1</sup>) that I did not trouble you the last Debate. I am sensible of the miseries we lie under through the loss of our Bill in the Lords House—It has been always the Privilege of the House of Commons to use Common Fame as an Information of things . . . Common Fame says ' That Lord Halifax advised,' and since he has owned the Dissolution of the last Parliament. I think therefore, that in justice you can do no less than vote him an Enemy to the King and Kingdom, and address his Majesty, that he would be pleased to remove George Earl of Halifax from his Councils.

MR. COLT : I have heard as much as this in Common Fame, and that he hopes to be Governor of Ireland,<sup>2</sup> and that he was an Advocate against that Bill we sent up to the Lords . . . I second the Motion. . . .

SIR NICHOLAS CAREW : . . . Lord Halifax sees that Popery will come in, and he will turn. Pray remove him.

MR. VERNON : I have heard that this Lord obstructed our Bill in the Lords House, and has showed how dangerous it was to remove the Duke from the Succession, considering he has an Army under his command in Scotland, and that three parts in four are Papists in Ireland.<sup>3</sup> I heard he should say ' That if the Lords would reject the Bill, he would engage, on his Honour, to bring in such a Proposition as would please the Parliament.' I would rather have his head, than any Popish Lord's in the Tower.<sup>4</sup>

SIR WILLIAM HICKMAN : You are now come to some particulars against this Lord of what he should say in the Lords House. But is that Parliamentary ? . . . What he said was<sup>5</sup> in the last Parliament, which is dissolved, and did he not withdraw from the Council since the Prorogations of this Parliament ?<sup>6</sup> . . .

MR. MONTAGU : . . . I think he went away from Court in

<sup>1</sup> Grey's *Debates*, viii. 21. These reports, though extremely valuable, are of course condensed and imperfect.

<sup>2</sup> Is this an indirect thrust at his relation to Lord Strafford ?

<sup>3</sup> See *ante*, p. 217.

<sup>4</sup> Several Popish Peers were at this time in the Tower, on charges connected with the Popish Plot. One of these was subsequently executed ; another died in prison.

<sup>5</sup> Was said by him (?).

<sup>6</sup> By which the meeting of Parliament, as we have seen, had been delayed from October 1679 to October 1680.

March, and came again in September. I think that is time long enough for this Lord to have had a share of the Prorogations. 1680

Colonel TITUS: . . . No man, I thought, was of firmer principles than this Lord was once of, nor could express them more upon several occasions. . . . That he withdrew, is true; but I would it were true that he had done no mischief since he came. . . . I am afraid that this great Lord did send for the Duke out of Scotland,<sup>1</sup> and I am afraid that no one has done more to render your Counsels ineffectual. . . . There is a great difference betwixt Common Fame and Rumour. Rumour is Vox Plebis (the Vulgar,) but Common Fame is Vox Populi.<sup>2</sup> . . . I am afraid that, in the case of this Lord, Common Fame is in the right, and therefore my opinion is, to address the King that he may be removed.

Sir WILLIAM TEMPLE:<sup>3</sup> . . . For four or five months I have not spoken a word here, upon public occasions, to this Lord, so that for the present I know not any thing of him; but formerly he was a man so different in principles from what I now hear said, that I wonder at it. Common Fame I take to be a great aggravation of crimes, but it must come from Evidence of actions. I have no more to say, but that I am tender of anything that may happen of ill consequence to break the happy Union betwixt the King and you. . . . But whether you will mention any Counsellors that have advised his Majesty ill, or whether you will defer it till the Address<sup>4</sup> be drawn up, and then apply persons to particular matters in it, I submit it to you.

Mr. HARBORD: . . . I wonder to see every man cool, now a man is named; this is unbecoming an Englishman. I know not how Lord Halifax came to be an Earl (the King knows that) and therefore more capable to do harm. I am satisfied in my conscience that I know he dissolved the last Parliament, and I can prove it. I blame not free Counsel to the King, but when Counsel was so boldly given by this Lord, and the Nation so near misfortune, he should be seldom trusted for future Counsel. (Other Lords have been of the mind for<sup>5</sup> Parliaments, but they have given satisfaction.<sup>6</sup>) Had not that Parliament been dissolved, Sir George Wakeman<sup>7</sup> had not been saved, nor the

<sup>1</sup> During the preceding spring. The absurdity of this charge will be manifest to all who have read chapter vii.

<sup>2</sup> Instances (*temp.* Henry IV., Henry VI., and Charles I.) of men removed or accused on Common Fame; he quotes Strafford's authority for the opinion.

<sup>3</sup> Who had, with a rather pusillanimous prudence, refrained from expressing *any opinion on the Exclusion*, either by vote, debate, or private conversation.

<sup>4</sup> On the state of the nation; in answer to the King's message concerning Tangier.

<sup>5</sup> As regards (?). This addition is given from the letter of Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Henry Stdney, November 19 (Blencowe, ii. 128). She calls Harbord 'your friend, Mr Herbert.' The two names were often confused.

<sup>6</sup> He obviously refers to Sunderland and Essex.

<sup>7</sup> The Queen's physician, a Papist who had been accused of participation in the Plot, but acquitted.

1680 King's Evidence reproached.<sup>1</sup> By that Dissolution the King has been eighteen or twenty months in danger. I am ashamed to see this man have Advocates. Whoever is so, deserves to appear at the Bar. . . . His Quality, Greatness, and Parts support and buoy up the Duke's interest at Court. I would have no such thing touched upon here of what passed from him in the Lords House. . . . This man takes the weight of three Kingdoms in his hand, and will frame notions of Expedients to cure the danger of the Nation.<sup>2</sup> If this must pass, I fear the Nation will be lost; he and his Party have induced your ruin. I would therefore remove them. . . .

SIR CHRISTOPHER MUSGRAVE:<sup>3</sup> If men must be styled 'Advocates' for a person, when they speak their mind freely in Parliament, and are denied liberty of Debate, you destroy the Constitution of the Government. Whilst I sit here, I hope I shall have my liberty. I have heard things said this day that were never done in Parliament, for a Gentleman to take notice of what is said in the Lords House. . . . Each House has liberty to retain or reject Bills as they please. You are now pleased to accuse this Lord, and a Gentleman tells you, 'That it is the Common Fame, that he dissolved the last Parliament.' I think that was ill Advice, and have always said so. [But] What! is Common Fame, talked of in Coffee-Houses, a sufficient charge against a man? . . . And we have found by experience that such Addresses have not had good success with the King. Against the Duke of Lauderdale you examined four Witnesses at the Bar (&c.). Where any body gives opinion in Council, circumstances must be considered. Let proofs demonstrative be brought to the Bar, before I can give my consent to such a Motion.

MR. HARBORD: I should be to blame to call any man 'an Advocate' for this Lord, that is not. . . . But to make an harangue or encomium on his person, that is to be an Advocate. It is his Counsel, not his Person, that gave occasion to this Debate. I did not speak of what he said in the Lords House, but his Counsels have been pernicious, and I would have him removed.

After some further wrangling as to the obnoxious term, Colonel Birch suggested an adjournment of the debate.

Sir Francis Winnington defended *accusations* on common fame, by the analogy of a (Grand?) Jury ('s presentment?').<sup>1</sup> He intimated that the absence of the Earl's name from the Protestation in the 'Lords' Journal' constituted matter of record as to his action in the recent debate.

<sup>1</sup> The reputation of the Popish Plot witnesses was on the decline, and Scroggs, the presiding judge on Wakeman's trial, had belittled them.

<sup>2</sup> See *ante*, p. 247.

<sup>3</sup> Anti-Exclusionist.

<sup>1</sup> So we interpret the sentence which heads p. 27, vol. viii., Grey's *Debates*. Security for good behaviour might be granted against persons accused by 'Common Fame' or living sumptuously without visible means of support (Chitty's *Burn's Justice of the Peace*, edit. 1845, vol. v. p. 1217).

. . . This man (he cried) will save his friend the Duke, and lose his Religion. . . . It may be, the King will tell us we are misinformed; then all is well. . . . I would propose this for your Question, 'That it is the opinion of this House that this Lord is an evil Counsellor, and an Enemy to the King and Kingdom, and that we desire him to be removed from his Majesty and his Councils for ever.'

Sir THOMAS MERES: Here is mention made of the Power of the Duke, and that that was an Argument from Lord Halifax to throw out the Bill in the Lords House.<sup>1</sup> I thought I had reason to tell that Lord 'If the Duke had such Power, it was time to take it out of his hands!' Supports the motion.

Mr. TRENCHARD<sup>2</sup> observed 'we ground this Vote upon the effects of the Prorogation. We know not who did it, but we see who is near the King,<sup>3</sup> and the Advice may be reasonably attributed to him.'

Col. TITUS quoted a precedent (*temp.* Henry IV.) of Persons removed 'because odious to the people;' and was answered by FENCH<sup>4</sup> who dismissed the precedent, as the act of a Usurper, dependent on popular favour. He pointed out, that Prosecutions on Common Fame necessitate witnesses; that the Protests in the Lords' Journal are not matter of record; and that to remove a Peer from the King's presence, which must include his presence in Parliament, involves a breach of Privilege.

Sir THOMAS THYNNE: The vote proposed is a condemnation. Without any proof, you judge this Lord. It is said, 'That he advised the Prorogation of the last' Parliament;' but Common Fame says the contrary. He was in the Country. Let Common Fame be for him, as well as against him.

Mr. POWLE thought the debate unseasonable, and conducive to disunion; and moved the Adjournment; Mr. GODOLPHIN<sup>6</sup> wished to lay the debate aside.

Mr. HYDE:<sup>7</sup> I am against this summary way of Justice. . . . Common Fame seems to me not strong enough. I have had it from this Lord, that he did not advise the Prorogation of the last<sup>8</sup> Parliament; and I may believe that, as well as others, that he advised the Dissolution of the last Parliament<sup>9</sup>. Other people concurred as well as he, and some<sup>10</sup> that were then in

<sup>1</sup> See *ante*, p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> A leading Exclusionist.

<sup>3</sup> Trenchard, a Somersetshire gentleman, does not seem to have known that Lord Halifax had been in retirement.

<sup>4</sup> Anti Exclusionist.

<sup>5</sup> Probably '*this last*.'

<sup>6</sup> Exclusionist and member of the 'Second Triumvirate.'

<sup>7</sup> Laurence Hyde, of the Treasury, and member of the second Triumvirate; brother-in-law of the Duke of York, and strongly opposed to the Exclusion.

<sup>8</sup> Probably '*this last*.'

<sup>9</sup> The report is so condensed that it is difficult to follow. We believe it should be interpreted thus: Hyde has it on the authority of Halifax that he did not advise the prorogation of *this last* or existing Parliament, and Hyde thinks he has as much right to believe this as others have to believe that Halifax advised the dissolution of *the last* or *preceding* Parliament.

<sup>10</sup> Charly Sunderland and Essex.

1680 credit, and more likely to do it. To revenge one <sup>1</sup> Counsel upon one Counsellor, and let the rest escape, is unjust.

Sir JOHN HOTHAM : . . . I . . . find that this Lord was the great occasion of throwing out this Bill. If we start such a man as this, and are afraid of him - He is a great Minister, and strikes with the great hammers [ - ] . . . he may do yet more [mischief]. . . . You have sufficient cause to address the King to remove this man from the Council ; but not for the rest of the Question.

The result of this heated discussion was now but a foregone conclusion. Proceedings had been unusually protracted, and the House of Lords, which had resumed its debate on Securities, adjourned while the sitting was in progress. As Lord Halifax passed through Westminster Hall he learnt the nature of the business which still detained members in the House of Commons. With ostentatious indifference he proceeded, as he said, ' to his dinner,' declining all converse in the precincts, because 'men ' should not say he was making friends.'<sup>2</sup>

The supporters of Halifax now rallied their strength for a final effort, in the hope of securing at least a temporary delay ; and eventually the question was put ' That the Debate be adjourned.' It passed in the negative, by 219 to 95, about eighty members walking out of the House.<sup>3</sup> The House then resolved ' That an Address be made to his Majesty, humbly to desire his Majesty to remove George Earl of Halifax from his Majesty's Presence and Councils for ever ;' and a Committee was forthwith appointed to draft the address thus voted. This brought the sitting to a conclusion ; but Halifax House was thronged, later in the day, with sympathising members.

I am full of my Lord Halifax (writes Countess Dorothy two days later to her brother, in the vivacious, desultory letter from which we have already quoted more than once <sup>4</sup>) : . . . he had company enough with him <sup>5</sup> - but my Lord of Shaftesbury <sup>6</sup> and Mr. Montague have singled him out of the herd of sixty-three that were of his mind . . . having given no reason yet but that common fame said he had been for proroguing the Parlia-

<sup>1</sup> Evidently '*united*,' '*common*,' or '*identical*' counsel upon *one* of the responsible parties.

<sup>2</sup> Dorothy Lady Sunderland to Henry Sidney, November 19 (Blencowe, ii. 128).

<sup>3</sup> Dorothy Lady Sunderland (*ibid.*). This minority appears considerable when we remember that the third reading of the Exclusion Bill had been carried without a division.

<sup>4</sup> Blencowe's *Sidney*, ii. 127-9.

<sup>5</sup> In the vote against the Exclusion.

<sup>6</sup> This was incorrect ; Lord Shaftesbury disowned the address.

ment, and having very great parts, which made him the more dangerous . . . it was begun by Montague. And what followed showed it to be so perfectly malice that it made 98 for him. . . . What they will put in it<sup>1</sup> I know not, they must go to their invention. . . . In the afternoon his house was full of House of Commons' men. My son<sup>2</sup> was there at one time—that is the thorn in my side, though in every thing else they agree; but it cannot be as I would have it, so long as my son is well with Lord Shaftesbury.

Halifax has desired the King to let him go—they will come much nearer to his Majesty's concerns than my Lord Halifax. My nephew, Pelham,<sup>3</sup> voted for him, Sir W. Jones<sup>4</sup> against him, but did not speak. In short, he<sup>5</sup> says he will speak his mind, and not be hanged, so long as there is law in England. I am not well—pardon this narrative. I were a beast if I were not concerned for so perfect and constant a good friend.

Sir William Coventry displayed equivalent anxiety, and evinced on behalf of his nephew an almost pusillanimous prudence.<sup>7</sup>

. . . yrs of 17, and yr other (he wrote November 21 to Sir Thomas Thynne from his seclusion<sup>6</sup>) . . . prepared mee for the printed votes,<sup>7</sup> soe that I was not much surprised by them, indeed I have all along expected some such stroake. I hope my L<sup>d</sup> sustains it w<sup>th</sup> the moderation I wish hee should, the only thing grievous in it, is the being ill painted by a H of Commons, for the exclusion from Councell (as things stand) I take to bee eligible, and you know have long wished him out. The times are soe uncertaine, and humours are in soe high a fermentation, that I cannot see how a man of moderation can take joy in acting. I have written to my L<sup>d</sup><sup>8</sup> to beg him to have a watch upon himself, that the opposition of his enemies may not thrust him into another party, but that hee keepe upon a nationall bottome, w<sup>ch</sup> at length will prevaile. I doe not much apprehend the threats against you . . . nor will it (in coole blood) bee thought a haynous thing to have performed an act of kindness to a friend and relation.

I hope my L<sup>d</sup> will not lett himselfe bee made the occasion of difference betwixt the K<sup>e</sup> and house of Com: but rather sollicite his owne retreat, contenting himselfe to keepe up his owne spirit and value by acting w<sup>th</sup> freedome in the house of L<sup>d</sup>, according to the nationall interest; whilst wee are thus jangling I foresee the Sovereigne Princes will despaire of us, and run in to France, from whence will come an irreparable ruine. . . .

<sup>1</sup> The address.

<sup>2</sup> Sunderland.

<sup>3</sup> Son of her sister Lady Lucy Pelham.

<sup>4</sup> Whose daughter Mr. Pelham had married.

<sup>5</sup> Halifax.

<sup>6</sup> *Longleat MSS.*

<sup>7</sup> The votes of the House were at this time regularly printed, an innovation much censured in some quarters.

<sup>8</sup> His letter is not extant.



1680 Meanwhile affairs moved fast, and on Monday, November 22, Mr. Trenchard reported the Address, which ran originally as follows :—<sup>1</sup>

*Most Gracious Sovereign*

We your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects,\* the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, being deeply sensible of the manifold dangers and mischiefs which have been occasioned to this your Kingdom by the Dissolution of the last Parliament, and by the frequent Prorogations of this present Parliament, whereby the Papists have been greatly encouraged to carry on their hellish and damnable Conspiracies against your Royal Person and Government, and the Protestant Religion now established amongst us, and have had many opportunities to contrive false and malicious Plots against the Lives and Honours of several of your loyal Protestant Subjects ; <sup>2</sup> and having just reason to believe, that the said Dissolution was (secretly and clandestinely <sup>3</sup> [?]) promoted by the evil and pernicious Counsels of *George Earl of Halifax*, do therefore most humbly pray your Majesty, for the taking away of occasions of distrust and jealousy between your Majesty and us your faithful Commons, and that we may with greater cheerfulness proceed to perfect those matters now before us, which tend to the Safety and Honour of your sacred Person and Government, and to the preservation of the true Protestant Religion, both to ourselves and our Posterity, That you would be graciously pleased to remove the said *George Earl of Halifax* from your Presence and Councils for ever.

At this stage of the proceedings an acrimonious debate<sup>4</sup> ensued. The friends of Halifax Sir William Hickman,<sup>5</sup> Sir Thomas Clarges,<sup>6</sup> Lord Cavendish, Colonel Birch,<sup>7</sup> Mr. Powle, &c., of the old 'Country' party, and Secretary Jenkins, Sir Christopher Musgrave, &c., among the Courtiers—endeavoured to recommit and thus to shelve the Address. 'The last Parliament,' exclaimed Sir Thomas Clarges, 'we had quartering soldiers taken away by a Clause in the Tax-Bill; and we had the *Habeas Corpus* Bill passed, and both by this Lord's mediation; which was worth forty Prorogations. They were exposed to the Council, and had all the Forms observed; and it was happy they passed; and I know that this Lord

<sup>1</sup> Grey's *Debates*, viii. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Allusion to the 'Meal-tub Plot.' (See *ante*, p. 197, note 3.)

<sup>3</sup> These words are not part of the address as eventually adopted.

<sup>4</sup> Grey's *Debates*, viii. 41-51. The debate, though long, is worth reading.

<sup>5</sup> Who observed that, far from countenancing the 'Meal-tub Plot,' Lord Halifax had been one of the destined victims.

<sup>6</sup> Brother of the first Duchess of Albemarle.

<sup>7</sup> Who properly censured the inference 'That persons not zealous enough for this Address are against the Protestant Religion.'

had a great hand in it.'<sup>1</sup> On the other side were the Exclusionist leaders, Titus, Winnington, Harbord, Carew, Paul Foley, &c., who after a fierce dispute carried the day by 213 votes to 101. Musgrave then moved the omission of the words 'secret and clandestine,' which, as Temple<sup>2</sup> had already pointed out, cohered badly enough with the allusion to 'Common Fame.' Titus hereupon observed, 'I am not of opinion that this Lord did it not "clandestinely," but am very confident of this, that he did publickly own it.' The words were then omitted by vote.<sup>3</sup>

The Address was duly presented to the King, and laid in proper course before the Council. Lord Halifax offered to retire, but Charles refused to accept his resignation.<sup>4</sup> Lord Essex appears to have quoted several precedents of persons removed from office at the instance of 'Common Fame;' while Lord Sunderland, on the contrary, ostensibly supported the interests of his brother-in-law. But after Council, to quote Sunderland's own version,<sup>5</sup> 'Lord Halifax went to lord Sunderland's lodgings, where they fell into discourse of what had passed; and lord Sunderland told him, that though he had given his opinion at council as he thought became him; yet, if such an address should ever be made against himself, he should certainly desire leave of the king to retire, as a thing that would be for his service. Upon this lord Halifax fell into such a passion, that he went out of the room, and from that time they hardly lived in any common civility where they met.'

The King's answer to the Address<sup>7</sup> was read in the House of Commons, November 26, by Secretary Jenkins:—

<sup>1</sup> This interesting assertion occurs, as far as we are aware, nowhere else. (See p. 159, note 1.)

<sup>2</sup> Temple's conduct was very temporising. He pointed out that the punishment designed fell under two heads—the censure of the House, and removal from the person of the King. The former had been already accomplished. The latter attempt, if likely to succeed, might be advisable; but perhaps it was better not to run the risk of a difference between King and Commons.

<sup>3</sup> Powle had also opposed these words, which Winnington had professed his readiness to omit.

<sup>4</sup> Macpherson, i. 106.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 110.

<sup>6</sup> Given to Temple (*Memoirs*, ii. 541 (*Works*, edit. 1770)). Temple declares that he had never suspected direct intercourse between Sunderland and Shaftesbury till told of it by Halifax.

<sup>7</sup> Fountainhall, a Scotch lawyer of Moderate views, who kept a diary of public events, records these incidents very quaintly. The Commons, he says (p. 13), have addressed against 'George Earl of Halifax (who very lately was the great idol of the Commons, but had now deserted them, and stept asyde to dine with his Majesty).'

1680 Charles R.<sup>1</sup>

His Majesty, having received the Address of this House relating to the Earl of *Halifax*, hath thought fit to return this Answer :

That he conceives the said Address to be liable to several exceptions : But, having a great desire to preserve all possible good understanding with this House, he chuses to decline to enter into particulars, to avoid all occasions of dispute : He therefore thinks fit to tell them, That he doth not find the Grounds in the Address of this House to be sufficient to induce him to remove the Earl of *Halifax* : But he answers them, at the same time, 'That, whenever this House shall, in a due and regular course, prove any Crime either against the said Earl of *Halifax* or any other Person, who either now is, or shall hereafter be, in his Council, he will leave him or them to their own legal defence, without interposing to protect them.'

Upon the day following this episode Dorothy Lady Sunderland<sup>2</sup> wrote further particulars to Henry Sidney:—

. . . I believe (she says) I was warm when I writ last with the malice to my Lord Halifax. My son<sup>3</sup> told me that they repent it, and were ashamed of it; but more than that, Tom Pelham,<sup>4</sup> who must be violent, or not live with father Jones,<sup>5</sup> told me the major part of the House was ashamed and sorry for it, but would not venture their credit for what they were indifferent to. So they went with the address, and yesterday the King sent them word [i.e., as above]. How they took the encouragement I know not; 'tis an answer as new as the charge, which Tom Pelham owns to be without precedent. I name him because of the way he goes.

I could tell a hundred other things. My Lord Cavendish desired them to let one alone they had nothing against for those they had. My Lord Shaftesbury disowns having anything to do in it, and my Lord Russell.<sup>6</sup> I heard 'twas Montague, and the two lawyers, Jones and Wimington, who show their profession.

I wish with all my heart the bill had passed, that they might not make that excuse for doing nothing for the King; . . . Montague was so ashamed, he did not say one word when the second debate was about carrying the address against my Lord Halifax, or laying it aside. . . . If they say any more, he<sup>7</sup> is

<sup>1</sup> Grey, viii. 87. The address and answer were published in the twenty-fourth number of the *Votes* of the House, licensed by Speaker Williams November 26. They will be found at p. 63 of the collected edition (1680).

<sup>2</sup> Blencowe dates this letter November 25; it must be November 27 (Blencowe's *Sidney*, ii. 131).

<sup>3</sup> Sunderland.

<sup>4</sup> Her nephew. (See *ante*, p. 257.)

<sup>5</sup> His father-in-law, Sir William (*ibid.*).

<sup>6</sup> This circumstance is striking, because Russell had openly said that if his own father had been against the Bill he would have voted him an enemy to his country. (See Burnet also for his abstinence on the present occasion : 'Russell and Jones, though formerly lord Halifax's friends, thought it was enough not to speak against him in the house of commons : but they sat silent' [edit. 1833. ii. 253].)

<sup>7</sup> Halifax.

ready to answer for himself. I tell him he would be talking. 1680  
I believe it will do him good in the general, it was so malicious.  
One asked what shall we charge him with? Montague said,  
with being an enemy to his King and Country. Winnington  
said: Let us take heed of that, we cannot prove it. Mr.  
Herbert's testimony <sup>1</sup> . . . pleased nobody. . . . A great many  
who differ from my Lord Halifax as to the bill, say few besides  
him that come within Whitehall could decide <sup>2</sup> the House at  
this time.

We may perhaps discount this letter to a certain  
extent, since it is probable that those who discussed the  
matter with the once beautiful and still fascinating  
'Sacharissa' preferred to deprecate her displeasure; but  
the general tone receives confirmation from the letters of  
Sir William Coventry addressed to Sir Thomas Thynne.

. . . I had noe hope (he writes) the Addresse against L. H.  
could stop when once resolved, hee will have much difficulty  
to conduct himselfe aright in this posture, but in my opinion,  
struggling would be the very worst method for him as well as  
for the K<sup>g</sup>, and therefore I hope he doth not think of that way.  
God direct him, and all you that are our legislators.<sup>3</sup> . . .

. . . I am glad if y<sup>r</sup> conjecture prove right of mens relenting,  
because that can doe noe harme; but I doe not see how they can  
make him amends, or how it is possible, at least probable, that  
relenting should be soe expressed as may do him good. Time  
only and his own conduct can heale such wounds as those[-] the  
continuance of his mettle is a good signe of the person, but  
I doubt can doe noe good to ye businesse.<sup>4</sup>

Upon Halifax himself meanwhile the events of the  
preceding month had made, it is clear, a profound and  
painful impression. Prepared as he had been to face a  
temporary odium, it was not without a shock that he  
realised in how great a degree the virulence of the  
extreme faction had invaded the ranks of the old Country  
party. He had anticipated perhaps that at least the  
'Moderate' seceders, whose own conversion had been  
so recently effected, would accord to his motives the  
justice of a candid construction. His awakening was  
bitter, as the following letter betrays, despite its apparent  
philosophy:

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>5</sup>*

Dec.  $\frac{13}{23}$ , '80.

You will before<sup>a</sup> this have one of mine <sup>b</sup> which giveth you  
some account of my late preferment in the House of Commons,

<sup>1</sup> See *ante*, p. 253.

<sup>2</sup> Sic in Blencowe; query 'divide.'

<sup>3</sup> November 27, *Longleat MSS.*

<sup>4</sup> December 4, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxx., p. 170.

<sup>b</sup> Not extant.

1680 who were pleased to make me a man of more importance than I am, the better to entitle me to the honour of being adressed against. I am not worth the notice they have been pleased to take of me, and I do not doubt of outliving the disadvantage this may seem to throw upon me, being resolved to give such evidence of myself, if I should continue to have any part in the publick business, as shall cure the suspicions men may have taken of me in a heat, for differing with them in some of their darling points, to w<sup>ch</sup> they are at present so wedded that no reason can be admitted in contradiction to them. Your kindness maketh this appear a heavier thing than either it is in itself, or then I apprehend it; the circumstances that attended it are more than the thing itself and yet I have borne it without much disquiet. I must only cast about for a new set of friends, for my old ones<sup>1</sup> have been so very zealous for the publick that some of them thought it as meritorious to persecute me as others believed it excusable to desert me: the history of it I reserve till I see you, and in the meantime whatever may be said from any other hand to lay any blame upon me, let it not find any great credit with you, for I dare undertake when you hear all you shall not need to make use of any partiality to incline you to judge of my side. I had a letter this day from your nephew dated at Turin, in his way to Venice. My L<sup>d</sup> Dorchester and L<sup>d</sup> Coventry are dead, which may give you the opportunity of mourning if you care for it. Yours.

The significant hint concerning 'new friends' demands our special attention. It is evident that the ungovernable fury of the Exclusionists, as Sir William Coventry had feared, drove Lord Halifax, almost perforce, into the arms of the Hydes, the Reresbys, and the Musgraves - men with whom, at heart, he had very little in common, but who had shown a chivalrous courage in defence of his person and his opinions.

Sir John Reresby<sup>2</sup> throws considerable light upon this aspect of the question. On November 24 he records: 'My Lord Halifax told me that he had no ways deserved this heat of the Commons against him. I said he ought not to be concerned, for he had got more friends by it than he had lost. . . . He said he would venture his life with those friends.' On November 28 he wrote,<sup>3</sup> 'I went to wait on my Lord Halifax, who, after the great service he had lately done the Crown . . . was looked upon as the rising man and first favorite. He carried me with him in his coach to Whitehall: the next day he invited me to dinner with him

<sup>1</sup> We may, perhaps, instance Sunderland, Temple, Winnington, Jones, and Essex.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs* (1875), p. 192.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 193.

in private. He told me it was to be feared some unhappy 1680 differences might arise in the nation from these disputes about the succession; and in case it should come to a war, it might be convenient to form something of a party in one's thoughts. He told me that he knew very well there was but one other and myself that had any considerable interest in my neighbourhood; asked me my opinion how their inclinations stood.' Reresby promised to bring the Earl a formal statement. 'I did so,' adds Reresby, 'and he did agree with me that the loyal interest was not only much more numerous, but consisted of more wealthy and active men; and that those who were so busy in Parliament against the Court,<sup>1</sup> were men of little power or esteem in their country.'

Meanwhile we must return to the proceedings of the House of Lords in so far as they concern the 'Expedients.' Temple<sup>2</sup> appears to misinterpret the situation. He believed that Charles had undertaken to *submit* a scheme, through the agency of Lord Halifax, to the Houses; it is evident, on the other hand, that Charles intended the proposals to *emanate* from Parliament, reserving to himself the right of veto. What share Lord Halifax took in the preparation of the Bill<sup>3</sup> which embodied the Lords' suggestions<sup>4</sup> is not known, but we may conclude that the measure expressed in the main his standpoint; and the extreme severity of its provisions afforded warrant for some sarcasm on the part of the Exclusionists. It provided for an automatic meeting of Parliament, within six months after the demise of the Crown in favour of a Popish successor. It necessitated, under similar circumstances, the entire suspension of the Royal right of veto during the reign of the Papist monarch; the temporary surrender of all ecclesiastical patronage held by the Crown; and the appointment of all officials by Parliament or its nominees.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The report of Reresby naturally takes its tinge from himself. 'Exclusionist' and 'Anti-Exclusionist' were the distinctions present, no doubt, to Lord Halifax himself.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, ii. 535, &c. (*Works*, edit. 1770). His reference is to 'Expedients,' 'which lord Halifax had charged himself with, and should be charged with to the house of Lords.' A little further he insinuates that these 'Expedients,' despite his remonstrances, never appeared.

<sup>3</sup> Read for the first time on November 29; it dropped with the session.

<sup>4</sup> As formulated by the Committee of the whole House on November 23 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, pp. 209, 222).

<sup>5</sup> James states (Macpherson, i. 111) that the Bill was applauded by Algernon Sidney and the Republicans as subversive of Monarchy.

<sup>6</sup> The Duke of York was to vacate his seat in Parliament on the spot, with the offices which he still held beyond sea.

1680 To the Duke of York, as we have already insisted, these 'Expedients' were yet more distasteful than the Exclusion; nor were they by any means acceptable in another and a very different quarter. As previously indicated, the Prince of Orange at this period derived his English intelligence almost entirely through Henry Sidney. Henry, we are aware, stood in close alliance with the Sunderlands; <sup>1</sup> he shared their 'Exclusion' fervour; and believed that the King's compliance, by reconciling our internal dissensions, could alone enable this kingdom to take an energetic part in Continental politics. The group, as we have hinted, were persuading the Prince, though personally opposed to the Exclusion, <sup>2</sup> that the measure was inevitable, <sup>3</sup> while the prerogatives, of which the 'Limitations' threatened to deprive a Popish monarch, would be hardly regained in the sequel by a Protestant Prince. <sup>4</sup> M. Van Leeuwen, the Dutch Ambassador, received orders to remonstrate with King Charles and with Lord Halifax upon this aspect of the situation; his interview with the latter, <sup>5</sup> however, alone concerns us here. As soon as the Ambassador had delivered to Lord Halifax the Prince's compliments he entered upon the business in hand.

Lord Halifax, says the Dutchman, <sup>6</sup> 'm'a répondu que depuis longtemps il estoit un serviteur très-acquis à V. A., qu'il espéroit que V. A. en estoit persuadé, qu'il vous avoit toujours considéré comme le seul Prince sur lequel le party protestant pouvoit faire fondement, que dans cette considération il avoit esté toute sa vie dans une vénération très-particulière pour V. A., et qu'il me vouloit parler

<sup>1</sup> The scandal of the day asserted that Sidney, who was notorious for gallantry, was the favoured lover of his nephew's wife. Lord Sunderland certainly on one occasion endorsed this rumour, but he was equally capable of collusion in his own dishonour and of sacrificing his wife's reputation to political exigences.

<sup>2</sup> As radically unjust (Blencowe, ii. 120-124, 126; November 3-22).

<sup>3</sup> And that, if the Prince did not concur, Monmouth (otherwise insignificant [see *ante*, pp. 237-8]) would reap the benefit (Blencowe, ii. 147-50, December 22-28, &c.). A similar belief had been carefully inculcated into the States. The rejection of the Bill had caused a painful impression at The Hague. The story of the memorial in its favour, sent through Henry Sidney, is well known (*ibid.* ii. 131-4, 143-6; November 24 to December 13). The Committee notes (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, ff. 44, 45) show that this was censured at the Committee on December 5. Lord Halifax was present, as also on December 9.

<sup>4</sup> See letter of November 30 (Blencowe, ii. 138-9). D'Avaux, we may remark, misinterprets the situation, and ascribes the Prince's conversion to an earlier date.

<sup>5</sup> Despatch of December 7<sub>17</sub> (Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. pp. 451-6).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 454.

si franchement que je verrois par là qu'il me faisoit des protestations véritables, qu'il sçavoit bien luy que M<sup>sr</sup> le Duc de York ne pouvoit pas régner<sup>1</sup> en Angleterre, qu'il n'y régneroit pas, que luy seroit le premier à s'y opposer, mais que V. A. se voulut donner bien garde des personnes qui la tromperoiént, qui avoient des visées particulières, et qu'ils ne vouloient présentement faire passer l'acte de l'exclusion du Duc de York que pour mettre hors de dispute qu'il estoit dans le pouvoir du Parlement de faire une séclusion ; que, si une fois, cela passé, cette brigue, dans un autre Parlement tirant cet exemple, dans deux ou trois ans d'icy, en conséquence, travaillera à faire d'autres séclusions et à y establir le Duc de Monmouth,<sup>2</sup> à quoy toute cette machine tend ; qu'il disoit cela en bon serviteur de V. A., que les precautions ne pouvoient nuire ny à V. A., ny à aucun autre de la Maison Royale, qu'ils estoient nommément et seulement contre James, Duc de York.'<sup>3</sup> The Dutchman, on the other hand, urged that Papists might without injustice undergo exclusion from the throne, since they were already deprived of their hereditary rights as legislators, and he urged various foreign precedents in favour of the principle. Lord Halifax, however, adds the diplomatist, 'me respondit que c'estoit la mesme chose, que par là le Parlement monstre-roit qu'il peut disposer de la succession, et que, si j'estois amy et dans les intérêts de V. A., je devois surtout tâcher d'empêcher cela, qu'après soub prétexte que V. A. estoit estranger ou semblable chose, on luy feroit tort dans ses droits . . . . Encor' (concludes the writer) 'que je ne convenois nullement de la solidité de son raisonnement, je n'ay pu le mettre d'autre opinion ; seulement il me dit qu'il estoit asseuré que les choses s'accorderoient et qu'on trouveroit des expédients convenables.'

Public attention was now diverted to the trial of one of the imprisoned Popish Lords, who had lain two years in the Tower under a charge of complicity in the Popish Plot. Lord Stafford, a younger son of the 'magnificent'

<sup>1</sup> I.e. evidently 'govern ;' he cannot have intended to suggest that the Duke could not succeed to the throne.

<sup>2</sup> D'Avaux perpetually insists that Orange was acting in concert with Monmouth, and made use of him as a tool. The opinion is unfounded. At this period they certainly stood in the position of rivals. As regards English affairs, d'Avaux, by reason of his purely second-hand information, his tendency to accept the reports of mercenary spies, and his inability to grasp the actual situation, is very untrustworthy.

<sup>3</sup> The Bill (see the abstract given as an appendix to this chapter) is not altogether superior to the charge of careless draughtsmanship in this respect, as Burnet (ii. 251)\*points out.



1680 Earl of Arundel, was therefore cousin to Lord Halifax, and his trial happened to be the first which had taken place in Westminster Hall, with all the ceremonies of an impeachment for high treason, since the trial of Lord Strafford forty years before. Many fortuitous coincidences induced among the superstitious a belief that the civil dissensions to which the earlier trial had been the prelude were about to break forth anew. The names of the accused differed but by a letter. Lord Stafford's father had presided as Lord High Steward at the trial of Lord Strafford; Sergeant Maynard, who had appeared among the managers on the former occasion, once more, in extreme old age, represented the Commons.

During the course of these painful proceedings<sup>1</sup> the 'Plot' witnesses repeated anew the perjuries which had already brought so many victims to the gallows; and though the discrepancies of their evidence were glaring, their assurance staggered some who were not altogether disposed to credulity. The unfortunate prisoner—old, infirm, unaided made but a feeble defence,<sup>2</sup> and was eventually convicted by a majority of twenty-four. How many of these voted conscientiously, and how many under fear of the Commons, let us not too curiously inquire. To the credit of Lord Halifax it must be said that he ranks among the thirty-one Peers who, rising each in his place, with his hand upon his breast, pronounced the prisoner '*Not guilty, upon my honour.*' That some of his friends did not share the Earl's conviction of the prisoner's innocence, or inclined at any rate to censure Lord Halifax for braving, a second time, the vengeance of the Commons, we learn from a fine passage which occurs in a letter written by Halifax to his brother.<sup>3</sup> 'If,' he says, 'I could talk with you, I should . . . little doubt of . . .' (convincing you as regards the matter) 'of my L<sup>d</sup> Stafford, in which you are possess'd I see by the powerfull majority, which is not at all times found to be in the right. A man must never hope a pardon for small sins if he will digest great ones, and where blood is in the case there is not, or at least ought not to be, any room for prudence. That an honest man is a very scurvy calling I agree with you; but having used it so long I do not know how to change, but must be content to keep to it with all its hazards and inconveniences.'

<sup>1</sup> November 30 to December 7.

<sup>2</sup> So even James II. admits.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, January 30, p. 176.

<sup>4</sup> The letter to which Lord Halifax refers seems to have been lost.

On such a subject, however, one friend at the least 1680 could be trusted to refrain from reproaches.

'... I did suppose,' wrote Sir William Coventry to Sir Thomas Thynne, December 13,<sup>1</sup> 'our friend had gained noe ground toward his quiett by what has lately passed, but if a man doe according to his conscience, the quiett of that is above any other to bee acquired in this world. God preserve you and him and us all.'

On December 29 Lord Stafford, with courage and dignity, suffered upon Tower Hill the supreme penalty of the law.<sup>2</sup> The same day Reresby dined with Lord Halifax. 'He said to me,' records Reresby,<sup>3</sup> 'Well, if it come to a war, you and I must go together.' 'I told his lordship,' adds Sir John, 'I was one that was ready to follow him, whatever happened.'

In the meantime the Exclusion struggle had reached another crisis. On December 15 'the King, in presence of both Houses, had practically recapitulated his speech at the opening of Parliament. He had recalled to the attention of the Houses both the Continental situation and the needs of Tangier, while repeating his own ultimatum as regards the policy of Exclusion, and reiterating his readiness to allow of less drastic expedients.

The Commons had retorted, December 20, with a very long address, wherein they offered, in consideration of the Royal assent, if accorded to the Bill of Exclusion and a subsidiary 'Association' Bill, a handsome pecuniary supply. It was anticipated that Charles would close with these very definite offers; the Stadtholder, in this belief, would have expressed, by a formal visit to England, his own acquiescence;<sup>4</sup> but Lord Halifax told Reresby<sup>5</sup> 'that it was like offering a man money to cut off his nose, which a man would not suffer for a greater sum.'

In the House of Lords meanwhile the debate on the

<sup>1</sup> *Longleat MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> He had agreed to preserve his life, if possible, by revealing the intrigues of his co-religionists as regards a toleration. In the course of his revelations he mentioned Shaftesbury's connection with the Indulgence of 1673. Some of the hotter spirits declared this had been arranged by Halifax to bring discredit on Shaftesbury. (See Burnet, ii. 270-72, whom Stafford had employed in the matter.)

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs* (1875), p. 197. Reresby added that Charles must not neglect his friends, and urged his own claims on a foreign appointment. Halifax returned: 'We must have you in business; we have need of such men nearer home.'

<sup>4</sup> This decision had been reached in Committee on December 14, Halifax being present (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,613, f. 45b).

<sup>5</sup> Blencowe's *Sidney*, ii. 148, 149. His object, of course, was to counteract the popularity of Monmouth.

<sup>6</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 195.

1680 speech of December 15 had been postponed for several days, and in the event<sup>1</sup> proved extremely vivacious. We gather that Lord Halifax advised a further adjournment of the debate, until the publication of a Royal response to the address of the Commons; and that, incidentally, he enlarged upon the excellent results which would accrue in consequence of a spontaneous liberality on the part of the Houses. Lord Shaftesbury retorted in a celebrated harangue,<sup>2</sup> of which part is directly concerned with the recommendation of his nephew.

‘But, my Lords’ (so ran this branch of the oration), ‘what I rose up to speak was more especially to my Lord on the Earls’ bench that spoke last, and sits behind me; who, as he hath the greatest influence in our present councils, so he hath let fall to you the very root of the matter, and the hinges upon which all turns. He tells you that the House of Commons have lately made offers to the King, and he wonders we do not expect the King’s answer to them before we enter into so hot and high debates.

‘He tells you, if the King be assured of supplies, we cannot doubt of his compliance in . . . all<sup>3</sup> we can ask, for otherwise the King must fall into that which is the worst condition of a Prince, to have his people have no confidence in him.’ This position, however (that the grant of supply should precede the redress of grievances), Lord Shaftesbury vehemently opugnated.

delayed meanwhile, for reasons unspecified, a whole fortnight. On January 4, however, his Majesty informed the Commons that his own hostility to the Bill had been confirmed by the antagonistic attitude displayed towards the measure by a majority of the Upper House.

The debate upon this answer in the House of Commons was adjourned till January 7, and Lord Halifax, in the

<sup>1</sup> December 23.

<sup>2</sup> Of which a report, entitled the ‘Speech of a Noble Peer,’ was subsequently burnt by order of the House. It is given by Christie (ii. 383, 384; appendix, p. cii) and in the *Parliamentary History* (vol. iv.; appendix, p. cxi, where it is erroneously dated November 20).

<sup>3</sup> With special reference to the dismissal of the King’s Popish mistresses, which Lord Shaftesbury had demanded.

<sup>4</sup> Referred, December 25, by the Committee (Lord Halifax present) to the consideration of the Privy Council upon the Monday ensuing (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, f. 46b). On December 25 the Duke wrote to his confidant, Lord Dartmouth, that he hoped these violent gentlemen will soon be sent home and himself recalled; ‘but I feare Lord Halifax will not be for it, tho’ now one would thinke in reason he should, for he will want me to support him, and the government’ (*Ist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part v., p. 42).

interval, received intelligible hints of the probable upshot, 1680  
as appears from the following letter :-

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*

Jan. 2, 80-1.

Your answer<sup>2</sup> to mine by Mr. Nelson is in a style that of all others ought to be the most welcome to me. I like kindness best when it is in so plain a dress, and to be told by a brother, and, which is more, by a friend, what the world sayeth or thinketh of me; though their censures of me may be mistaken, yet I cannot be so in judging y<sup>r</sup> part to proceed only from true and perfect kindness, which I assure you is not thrown away upon me. Your opinion that I am in the right may be too partiall, but that I think myself so you may undertake for me, and I shall not deceive you, and if the points lately in question are errors on my side, I have this to say in my excuse, that I have hardly one friend that was not till very lately of that very opinion which is now accounted a mortal heresy; so that if by a greater measure of grace than I pretend to they have outran me by their sudden conversion, they ought to have been gentler to a weak brother than I have found them. If I could tell you the several steps of their behaviour to me, you would wonder they do not turn papists, since there is no other church in the world charitable enough to give them absolution for it. I would not much doubt of satisfying you in the great objections made against me, if I had time to discourse with you, but a letter cannot be made long enough to give you a clear light into things of this kind. You will I am sure give me some kind of credit when I tell you I am not such a volunteer in philosophy as to provoke such a storm as hath fallen upon me, from a mistaken principle of bravery,<sup>3</sup> to do a thing only because it is dangerous; but when upon enquiry I think myself in the right, I confess I have an obstinate kind of morality, which I hope may make amends for my want of devotion. It seems the foreign ministers have had my picture drawn by their correspondents not very much to my advantage. I guess who were the painters, and think I am not mistaken in it. Where all this will end, either in relation to myself or to the publick, God in Heaven only knoweth. I am at this hour threatened with more thunder from the House of Commons to-morrow; whether it will be so or in what manner I do not yet know, but where there is infinite anger there is reason to expect the worst;<sup>4</sup> for which I have recourse still to my small philosophy, and have not only the comfort of innocence to support me, but the impossibility of avoiding any strokes of this kind without such

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxxi., p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> The letter to which this refers is not forthcoming.

<sup>3</sup> *Bravery*, it should be remembered, was restricted in seventeenth-century parlance almost exclusively to the sense of 'defiance' or 'bravado.'

<sup>4</sup> He probably alludes to the possibility of *impeachment*.

16<sup>80</sup> indecencys (to give no worse term) as I can never digest: and, though I agree with you this is not an age for a man to follow the strict morality of better times, yet sure mankind is not yet so debased but that there will ever be found some few men who will scorn to join in concert with the publick voice, when it is not well grounded; and even that popular fury which may now blow in my face will perhaps with a little patience not only abate, but turn against these very men that now appear against me. I am interrupted, and so can only tell you I am for ever yours.

The debate of January 7 answered the forebodings of Lord Halifax. From the first, under the guise of an attack upon those who had inspired the King's reply (the ostensible subject of discussion), it took the form of a renewed assault upon himself.<sup>1</sup> Nor can we altogether wonder at these revived hostilities; for the situation, we must admit, was exasperating to a degree. The Commons perforce beheld the man whose dismissal they had so urgently demanded a regular attendant at Council and Committee, and necessarily exerting, in his own behoof, an influence over the King's Counsels which his abilities and his recent services rapidly enhanced.<sup>2</sup> His own friends, as we know, had deprecated such a defiance; Sir William Coventry, in particular, had counselled a voluntary withdrawal;<sup>3</sup> and in the House, as if to second their

<sup>1</sup> Grey's *Debates*, viii. 260-85.

<sup>2</sup> On December 18 Beresby was surprised to see the French Ambassador repair 'privately' to Halifax House on business, 'it being then unknown that his lordship set up for chief minister.' It should be observed that no charge of *underhand* dealing with the Frenchman is involved (*Memoirs*, 1875, p. 195).

<sup>3</sup> See his letters to Sir Thomas Thynne (*Longleat MSS*). We give some extracts. Thus, December 13, he asks in a postscript 'whether L<sup>d</sup> Hal. continue going to counsell and frequently to Court or not. for I am wholly a stranger to it, and I would not aske him the question, having told him my thoughts in 2 letters.' Sir Thomas, in response, seems to have argued that the point of honour forbade Halifax to desert his post; for Sir William rejoins, December 19, 'I cannot wholly deny what you say of the point of honour of our friend, but doe lament that things are in that posture, that honour will not lett a man act according to prudence. . . . Though our friend not going at all may looke meane, yett going very much drawes all the onus' (?) 'of what men dislike upon him.' December 25: 'It seemes to mee that hee stands in an opposition to that w<sup>ch</sup> none (that I can remember to have heard of) could ever w<sup>th</sup>stand; and stands upon a foundation w<sup>ch</sup> hath failed all before him.' (Elsewhere he adds, 'whoe thought they stood as fast as hee.') 'What can that end in? and I feare that as times grow more Criticall, soe he will (in the way hee is) bee obliged to plunge himselfe deeper, in the disadvantages hee now lyes under, till at last necessity on one hand, and point of honour on the other, will not leave roome for that security w<sup>ch</sup> I suppose hee might yett have; w<sup>th</sup>out doing anything mean or unworthy; and when times mend (if that blessing bee in store for us) there will bee more probability of admitting him to play his part, whoe keepees some reserve, and shewes a tempered regard, to y<sup>e</sup> publicke quiett, then for those whoe indulging to their provocation give themselves to extreames, w<sup>ch</sup> I

entreaties, the tone of the discussion was menacing to a 1689 degree.<sup>1</sup>

Will any man (cried Sir Henry Capel,<sup>2</sup> a brother of Lord Essex, and former associate of Halifax), will any man think that any Minister of State, a man rather of wit and tongue, and not of thought, one indifferent in Religion, who will go with or against Popery, as the torrent drives him; can any man think to have other Counsels from such a Minister? . . .

Later in the day Sir Henry expressed himself with even greater vehemence.<sup>3</sup>

. . . I must speak plainer to one particular Person. When I consider his Birth, Quality, and Father (and his former actions before he aspired) his Parts and Wit, so beyond other men; I have been silent to hear him fighting our Battles in the Lords House; and his conversation<sup>1</sup> to me was a great surprise. I should pardon him for all his faults, but now since he has had an addition to his Coronet, within a few years. Let him be what he will, I will not spare him; and it is the Earl of *Halifax*. He knows well, that our Government will not admit of a *Premier* Minister of State, to sway all things. The King has his Council to advise with, established by Law, and that in Corners and Chambers is not our Council of *England*. It may be, this Lord was not always so, and therefore the more dangerous. . . . I think the Debate of this Day is wholly as to the Ministers, and therefore it is not out of Order to offer you a Question, viz. 'That the Earl of *Halifax* has been the Promoter and Adviser of this last Message from the King, and that he is an Enemy to the King and Country.'

Lord RUSSELL rather inclined to blame Mr. *Hyde* for the answer; who however repudiated this responsibility; Sir JOHN HOTHAM observed, that 'there are more in the Kennel than Lord *Halifax*;' and Sir WILLIAM HICKMAN sarcastically interjected, 'I will never speak for a friend here. But after having given

doubt hee will bee obliged to if he make crossing his enemies the rule of his conduct, or bee very desirous of keeping his present station.' On January 19 Coventry explains himself more fully: 'It is a mistake to thinke honour obliges to resist things irresistible, it requires wee should not decline danger, but does not require going in the mouth of a Canon, or for a single man to fight against an army, wee must lay downe our lives rather than renounce our religion or betray or desert a friend whome wee might helpe in a good cause. but neither duty nor honour obliges us to run upon our owne ruine only to crosse an enemy of his purpose,' &c. These observations were evidently intended for Halifax. Coventry says elsewhere that he prefers to remonstrate through Sir Thomas, as he shrinks from the appearance of direct interference.

<sup>1</sup> One speaker reflected on all who had voted for Lord *Stafford*: another said 'If the Lords *had been left to themselves*, they would have passed this Bill' (Grey's *Debates*, viii. 261, 266).

<sup>2</sup> Who had *himself* supported 'Limitations' in the preceding Parliament. Lord Halifax considered him an adherent of Mounmouth (Devonshire House 'note book').

<sup>3</sup> Grey's *Debates*, viii. 280.

<sup>4</sup> Possibly 'conversion.'

16<sup>50</sup><sub>91</sub> Lord *Halifax* so large a commendation, I wonder the Gentleman (*Capel*) should conclude so bitterly against him . . . This is a great charge upon a man . . . But is there any proof of it against Lord *Halifax* in the least circumstance; only his Judgment given in the Lords House against the Bill? And I have heard, he has sat silent ever since.

Mr. HARRORD professed a respect for *Halifax*: but 'If a Gentleman's Plate be missing out of his Parlour, do not you enquire who has been there? It is plain this Lord is everlastingly with the King, and in private, and the Nation is like to be lost. He being locked up with the King, almost every day, I must impute these Counsels to Lord *Halifax*. . . .'

Sir THOMAS MERES dissented . . . 'I have formerly been much in this Lord's Company, but I think him no Papist; quite the contrary. Other Ministers have gotten, but this Lord has no Office, and this Vote will be very hard upon him. When men have plainly merited ill, and things are positively proved against them, you cannot go higher than this Vote.'

Colonel TRUS retorted: 'There is a difference between *Halifax's* Counsels and Principles;' and reverted to the former charge, concerning the Prorogation. 'We do not know who gives these Counsels, but we know who are at the King's uprising and down-lying, and ever with him. Some sort of fish are taken with worms, and some with flies, and this person is made an Earl; from being the best Freeholder in *England* to be the worst Earl in Court. '(I will not believe the Lord had been made an Earl had he been what Sir Thomas *Meres* spoke him, viz. a true Protestant.)' From him I expect persecution most, who was once one amongst us. 'The King can do no hurt, no injustice; Counsellors and Judges must answer for what is done. . . . We go not about to take away life or limb, nor to try a man . . . here is a Council that has ruined you . . . and I wonder for what single virtue they have so many friends.'

Lord CAVENTISH: 'I stand not up to speak for Lord *Halifax*, though I confess obligation to him, and will return it, when I am in a fit capacity, in another Place.' (This Vote) 'is a severe censure, or rather a punishment; but it does not appear to me that it is true that Lord *Halifax* advised this Answer [Is not for common fame<sup>1</sup>]. Is *Halifax* so absolute a Minister?<sup>2</sup> . . . *Halifax* might give ill Counsels, but not this ill Counsel' [Moves that ill counsellors may be removed, but to do it in a more Parliamentary way<sup>1</sup> and] cannot agree to the Question.

Mr. HARRORD: ' . . . Some of Lord *Halifax's* relations would have persuaded him to vindicate himself by retiring from public Employment, and that would have been something; but till that be done, I would give him no quarter.'<sup>3</sup>

Burnet probably refers to this debate when he says: 'Some called [Lord *Halifax*] a papist: others said he was

<sup>1</sup> Added in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 9, p. 113 (*Beaufort MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> Or, 'Is the Lord *Halifax* the onely man?' (*ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> The following sentence apparently relates to Mr. Hyde.

an atheist. Chichley, that had married his mother, <sup>1681</sup> moved, that I might be sent for to satisfy the house as to the truth of his religion. I wish,' adds the Doctor, 'I could have said as much to have persuaded them that he was a good Christian, as that he was no papist.'<sup>1</sup>

The House eventually resolved—(1) To insist on the Exclusion. (2) To refuse Supply in the meantime. (3) That the advisers of the 'Message' had given pernicious counsel, &c. (4) 'That George Earl of Halifax is one of the Persons who advised his Majesty, in his last Message to this House, to insist upon an Opinion against the Bill for excluding the Duke of York; and that he therein has given pernicious Counsel to his Majesty, and is a Promoter of Popery, and an Enemy to the King and Kingdom.' (5) 'That an Address should be presented for the removal of Lords Worcester, Clarendon, Feversham, Mr. Hyde, and Mr. Seymour.'<sup>2</sup>

Three days later Charles retorted with a prorogation of ten days.

The same day (says Reresby) waiting on the Lord Halifax, he complained of the unjust severity of the Commons against him in their vote, which was that he was a promoter of popery and betrayer of the liberties of the people. He said that were a man never so innocent, it coming from the representatives of the people, it was too heavy for any single person to bear; therefore, he had thoughts to retire from Court, but that he would go his own pace, and not just be kicked out when they pleased. And in case the King should at any time have occasion to use him in what was just, he should be ready to serve him ' . . . At the same time he complained of the unsteadiness of the King's temper, that whilst he seemed to approve the counsel you gave him, he hearkened to other counsels at a back door, which made him wavering and slow to resolve; (and people afraid to serve him).'<sup>3</sup>

The question now arose, and was debated at Council, whether the prorogation should be made the prelude to

<sup>1</sup> Edit. 1833, ii. 253, 254.

<sup>2</sup> An attempt had been made to postpone the debate against Hyde, but Mr. Gore said, 'If you do not proceed in this you do the Lord Halifax injustice' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 9. p. 114).

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, January 10, p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> Reresby adds, the Earl told him 'that as to my particular, if I would trust him, he would tell me when it was time to appear for the King's service; that I should run the same fortune with him, for I was one that the Government ought to be glad to have in business, with very kind expressions more than I deserved.'

<sup>5</sup> See Reresby, January 11, p. 200.



1689<sup>81</sup> a dissolution.<sup>1</sup> Lord Halifax appears to have opposed this suggestion both in his public and his private capacities. Reresby, however, does not seem to have taken his protestations very seriously. 'My Lord Halifax,' he says, under this date,<sup>2</sup> 'seemed averse to this dissolution; but it was but a pretence, for he had no reason to wish that Parliament long lived that had used him with such freedom.' But the assertions of Halifax are explicitly confirmed<sup>3</sup> by James himself. 'Halifax,' he says, 'was against the dissolution of the parliament till a further trial.'

Nor is the fact by any means surprising. It is clear that two, if not three, cogent arguments must have been present to his mind, any one of which was sufficient to render prorogation and dissolution alike distasteful. Either, in the first place, was certain to be laid at his door; and this fresh charge could not fail to aggravate the violence of his adversaries. In the second place, either must cut short the proceedings on the Lords' Limitation Bill, which by vote of January 4 had received important additions. These were—(1) that the Duke should be banished the country during the King's life,<sup>4</sup> and (2) that under the government of a Popish monarch the foreign relations of the kingdom, together with the management of Irish affairs, should be entrusted to Parliament when sitting, and during recess to Parliamentary Commissioners. These proposals, according to the threatened departure, would be necessarily nipped in the bud, and the House of Commons would be entitled to assert, not without justice, that no 'Expedients' had been laid before it in the name of that House which had so summarily disposed of the solution proposed by the Commons. In the third place, a rumour prevailed that in the event of a dissolution Lord Danby should be set at liberty. The prospect was exceedingly disagreeable to Lord Halifax, who, so Reresby tells us,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Temple's *Memoirs* (*Works*, 1770, ii. 536). Temple himself asserted the necessity of agreement between the King and his Parliament; either the existing, or a fresh one. 'Lord Halifax answered me in few words, that everybody was sensible of the necessity of the King's agreeing with his Parliament though not with this' (i.e. even if not). January 2 and January 16 were the two last Committee meetings of Council attended by Halifax during this period (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,643, ff. 47 and 47b).

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, January 18, p. 200. <sup>3</sup> Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 116.

<sup>4</sup> Whose information is generally very good on such points, as his friends kept him regularly posted. The *Dutch Despatches* (*Open*), January 1<sup>st</sup>, mention that Lord Salisbury quitted the Council in consequence of the dissolution, and add, 'they say also that Lord Halifax is quite determined to retire into the country' (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 14).

<sup>5</sup> According to the suggestion of Halifax, November 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Memoirs*, January 18, p. 200.

'was jealous . . . that my Lord Danby would come out of the Tower, and be received again into councils. If that happened, he resolved to retire, and advised me not to press to be in employment till things were upon another foot.'<sup>1</sup> 1680

The arguments of Lord Halifax, however, were overruled; and on January 18 a proclamation issued by which Parliament was dissolved, a new Parliament being summoned to Oxford<sup>2</sup> for the 21st of the ensuing March.

To his brother Lord Halifax wrote as follows on the subject:—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

Jan. 20, '80 1.

You have given full evidence of your kindness by your fears for me, which I suppose may increase when you hear of the dissolution of a Parliament. You may believe me when I tell you, this is not to be imputed to me, though I am far from arraigning the better judgments of those with whom I may differ in this particular. If it should happen, which is not unlikely, that I should go down to Rufford, you will be further convinced in this matter; and if I could talk with you, I should as little doubt of doing it in that of my L<sup>d</sup> Stafford.<sup>4</sup> . . . By what you say concerning my late friends, I find a statesman hath as much charity out of interest as a Christian hath from his religion, and is as easily reconciled to his enemies whenever the scene changeth, and that it suiteth well with his affairs. I confess I, who am slow to anger, when I am once thoroughly injured, am apt enough to retain it, not so far as to revenge myself, but only to remember, and not easily to trust again.<sup>5</sup> Your bill of naturalization did not want my help while the Parl<sup>t</sup> sat,<sup>6</sup> but, greater matters depending, it could not be dispatch'd; when the next meeteth I do not doubt but it will pass, if the session continueth any time. I wish Harry<sup>7</sup> would think of coming home, and not get such a habit of wandring as wou'd at last grow to a disease. You will have orders from hence to move the K. of France concerning the business of Bouvines and the disputes about the dependencies in Flanders; you will be so directed in the manner of doing it, that I need not say any more in it. Adieu.

<sup>1</sup> Reresby dissented from this opinion, and satisfied Lord Halifax. (See *Memoirs*, January 20, p. 201.)

<sup>2</sup> This detail excited grave suspicion and resentment, even in the less violent circles. The decision had been made on account of the strength of Exclusionist feeling in the city of London.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxxiv., p. 176.

<sup>4</sup> See the passage given on p. 266, *ante*.

<sup>5</sup> Probably this refers to Sunderland.

<sup>6</sup> A Bill to this effect was introduced on December 17 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, p. 259). Lord Halifax was on the Select Committee (*Lords' Journal*, xiii. 722).

<sup>7</sup> Lord Eland.

1680<sup>81</sup>

On January 21, the day after this letter was written, Reresby dined with Lord Halifax. The Earl, Sir John tells us,<sup>1</sup> 'seemed to hold his resolution to retire,' but said he had recommended Reresby for preferment to 'Mr. Hyde . . . his particular friend.'<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax also told Reresby 'he was not at all dissatisfied with the King, but feared the Duke's prevalency with the King would carry things too far.' In point of fact, even at this critical moment, the Duke and his champion stood by no means upon friendly terms. The Duke was jealous, lest 'Lord Halifax's proposal of a bill of banishment' should be adopted.<sup>3</sup> He very properly resented the urgency with which Lord Halifax had adjured him to renounce Popery.<sup>4</sup> He naturally feared that the expressed opinion of Halifax would obstruct his own return to England.<sup>5</sup> He believed that Lord Halifax had so arranged as that the advice of James himself, which was unfavourable to the calling of a fresh Parliament, could not be taken. 'I am sorry,' he wrote, 'to see Lord Halifax make such excuses, and take such pretexts to do what he does, he knowing very well he might have relyd on me, I having given him all the assurances of being his friend I could do'<sup>6</sup> . . . To conclude, while the Commons accused Lord Halifax of Popery, the Duke, possibly misunderstanding the nature of the Bill for clearing London of Papists,<sup>7</sup> maintained that a general banishment of Roman Catholics was his darling project.<sup>8</sup> Meanwhile Lord Halifax persisted in his resolution of retiring to the country, a decision which he carried into effect almost immediately, at a significant juncture. On January 24 the Exclusionist Junto (Lords Sunderland and Essex, with Sir William Temple) were dismissed the Privy Council, and it was clearly understood that Lord Sunderland would be required to resign the Seals at the earliest possible opportunity. Within twenty-four hours of this energetic proceeding Lord Halifax started for Rufford,<sup>9</sup> having previously communicated his intention to Mr. Savile in the following letter :—

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs* (1875), p. 201.

<sup>2</sup> The allusion is evidently to Hyde's defence of Halifax in the Commons.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part v., p. 57 (letter to Legge, February 2). These letters are seldom dated in full, and the editor has obviously misplaced a large number.

<sup>4</sup> Dalrymple, i. 352 (James to Legge).

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part v., p. 42 (misdated 1679), James to Legge, December 25 (1680); *Life of James*, i. 653.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part v., p. 47 (misdated 1679).

<sup>7</sup> But see Regency scheme, below. <sup>8</sup> *Life*, i. 594; Macpherson, i. 104.

<sup>9</sup> Lady Sunderland to Henry Sidney (Blencowe, ii. 166, January 25).

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*London, <sup>Jan. 25,</sup> Feb. 4, '80-1.

Your kind repeated earnestness to rescue me from the dangers you apprehend I am in from the general anger that hath of late been raised against me, coming from the warmth of your heart, as I am sure it doth, is a welcome though an unnecessary evidence of your mind towards me, and though I cannot absolutely agree to your prescriptions of a looser morality in things that relate to the publick, yet I am enough convinced, and was so even before my late experience, that there is a good deal of hazard in opposing the torrent of a House of Commons; but on the other side, it being the only definition of an honest man to be a lover of justice with all its inconveniences, I do not very well know how things of this kind are to be avoided, but by such means as would lye heavier upon me than all the votes or addresses an angry Parliament can throw upon me. I have had the good luck to have every unpopular thing imputed to me in the first place, and by going a strait way without any byass, or engaging in any faction, one part of the world hath been much more violent against me than the other hath been in my defence. All these disadvantages did not move me so as to quit my ground whilst the Parl<sup>t</sup> sat. I thought myself restrain'd by a necessary point of honour not to do that by compulsion which perhaps in itself was the thing in the world I most desired; but now that the Parl<sup>t</sup> is dissolved, I am going down to Rufford to breathe a little, and enjoy some quiet, which will be a very welcome thing to me, and when we<sup>2</sup> meet again at Oxford I must venture to go into the storm, and receive the shot once more of an angry House of Commons, except they should by a miracle grow into a better temper than is naturally expected from them. I shall at least have some respite, though I assure you it<sup>3</sup> was not my choice. I am for ever yours.

The disgrace of the Exclusionist Councillors was, of course, regarded as a Parthian shaft from the hands of their retreating antagonist. 'My Lord Halifax,' writes Anne Lady Sunderland<sup>4</sup> vindictively to Henry Sidney, 'said he would stay in town till my Lord were ousted, and then he would be gone, which he accordingly is to-day, but with two faces, for he tells the King he will certainly be at Oxford, and to the town he professes he will be torn to pieces before he will have any thing to do with it;

Roroby erroneously states that he went down on the 22nd. Lady Halifax followed some days later (Algernon Sidney to Henry Savile, February 10, 1680<sup>5</sup> [misdated 1679], *Letters*, p. 9).

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxv., p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> The House of Lords.

<sup>3</sup> The dissolution.

<sup>4</sup> January 25 (Blencowe, ii. 165-6).

1681 which his Lordship means, I know not, but am apt to think that he does not know his own mind ;' <sup>1</sup> and she insinuates with shrewd dexterity (the destination of her letter considered) that the real aim of the Court is to ruin the partisans of the Prince of Orange.

A week later the fall of Sunderland was completed. At the command of Charles he surrendered the Seals to Lord Conway, from whom he was not allowed to receive the usual pecuniary consideration.<sup>2</sup>

It was necessary to fill the vacancies in the Council. Of the incoming Counsellors, two scarcely call for mention. The third, Lord Chesterfield,<sup>3</sup> deserves some notice on account of the intimate relations which subsequently prevailed between him and Lord Halifax. In age a contemporary of Savile and the scion of a staunch Royalist house, Lord Chesterfield had expiated his loyalty, in the days of the Commonwealth, by heavy losses and an exile of several years. His youth had been very irregular ; and the scandal of the day had imagined a horrible— and, it would appear, an unfounded— legend, that he had poisoned his second wife <sup>4</sup> in the cup of the Communion ; a story of which his uninterrupted friendship with her family affords the best confutation. A man of ability and penetration ; something of a valetudinarian ; and, despite his

<sup>1</sup> See also her letter of January 18 : ' I really believe [the King] is *under a promise to Lord Halifax and Mr. Sc'y'mo'ur, who are the great and I think only Connellors* in this plan to clear the Court of all the factions, for, so may it please you, *are we and all of our minds called*. . . . The town says, *Lord Halifax means to expiate his faults by going away*, and if he does, 'tis like the tale of the maid, who set her master's house on fire and ran away by the light of it' (Blencowe, ii. 159, 160).

<sup>2</sup> There is some reason to believe that the seals were offered to the Duke of Newcastle, whose sister-in-law, be it remembered, Halifax had married. (See Reresby, January 11. 15 ; he cannot allude to a seat in the Council, of which Newcastle was already a member.) Newcastle refused, chiefly from jealousy of his brother-in-law and of the preponderating influence which his great talents assured him both in national and local counsels. Under these passions his earlier and devoted attachment to Halifax had evaporated, nor did he fail to resent the reserve maintained towards himself ; ' it was not using him like a brother.' Reresby, who was intimate with both, does not wonder that Halifax refrained from confiding in one so much his intellectual inferior.

<sup>3</sup> Sworn January 26 (Luttrell, *Diary*, i. 63).

<sup>4</sup> The beautiful Elizabeth Butler, daughter of the Duke of Ormonde. His marriage had been dictated rather by policy than inclination, and before her charms had attracted his affection she had become alienated by his former coldness. The attentions of the Duke of York had aroused her husband's jealousy, who had suddenly retired with her to the country. The absence of that complaisance too common in his day seems to have been the only foundation for the dreadful interpretation placed upon her death, which occurred suddenly three years later. (For the story, see Jesse's *Memoirs of the Court of England*.)

devoted attachment to the House of Stuart, very independent in his opinions, he had meddled little in politics, till he had distinguished himself by opposition to the Exclusion Bill. On his admission to the Privy Council he wrote<sup>1</sup> to Lord Halifax, thanking him for the effects of his kindness. 'His Majesty,' he adds, 'did lately speak of your lordship with great expression of esteem and kindness; and sayd, that, notwithstanding the reports of the town, he did not doubt but that you would be the same in the parliament at Oxford, that you had been in that of Westminster. . . .' Lord Halifax answered as follows:—

• *The Earl of Halifax to Lord Chesterfield.*<sup>2</sup>

Rafford, 1680.

My Lord, —Your favour to mee ought to have been prevented by my congratulations, for that which I have long wished, but not so long as your lordship hath deserved it, and greater things; and, I doe not doubt, but the angry part of the world will be much pussell'd how to find an objection to anything of honour or advantage, that shall be so well plac'd, as they will be upon your lordship. My thoughts in relation to the publike are perfectly known to you, and having had your approbation, it must be some very powerfull argument that can perswade mee to alter them; but I, who have the ill fortune to turne papist,<sup>3</sup> and yet knew nothing of it my selfe, can answer for nothing but that, which is impossible for mee to faile in, I mean by being ever

My Lord,

Your &c.

During the course of the Parliamentary recess Sir John Reresby, who saw a good deal of Lord Halifax<sup>4</sup> and was employed by him upon some private business,<sup>5</sup> enjoyed two long and interesting conversations with the Earl. In the first 'His lordship told me,' says Reresby,<sup>6</sup> 'the King would not call a Parliament so speedily as was believed;

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Second Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 237 (misdated 1682).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 238.

<sup>3</sup> Allusion to the Commons vote.

<sup>4</sup> He enjoyed the Savile and Newcastle interests at Newark, for which he was elected, receiving the congratulations of either potentate.

<sup>5</sup> Concerning a treaty of marriage between Lord Eland and a daughter and co-heiress of Newcastle, one of the young ladies of whom it was unkindly remarked that they 'stood in need of great fortunes' (*Hatton Correspondence*, i. 240). The matter fell through, partly owing to money differences. Halifax asked 15,000*l.* down, but Newcastle was anxious to postpone his daughter's portion till after his own death; moreover, he had heard reports that the young man was very dissolute, reports which the subsequent career of Lord Eland confirm. Reresby's position was rather invidious, as strained relations existed between the brothers-in-law. Halifax declared the Duke was 'of so changeable and jealous an humour that it was not possible to keep friendly with him' (Reresby's *Memoirs*, pp. 204, 206, 207).

<sup>6</sup> February 12, *ibid.* p. 204.

1689<sup>80</sup> that the King was slow to resolve where any difficulty arose. That he intended to go to Parliament whenever it assembled ; but that afterwards he would leave the Court and business, except his Majesty would be advised to do such things as were for the public good, change some officers about him, and take such in their room as would act according to the present councils. For it would ruin all if his Majesty continued to advise with those of one interest this day, and hearken to those of another to-morrow ; nor could his ministers be safe under such uncertainties. And if he would be advised, it was in the King's power to make all his opponents tremble. In fine, he told me a great part of his thoughts, and made me many professions of friendship.' On the second occasion ' my lord told me some began to question whether or no the King would continue constant to his brother, or take part with the Duke of Monmouth,<sup>2</sup> who was now treating to make his peace.' With his brother meanwhile Lord Halifax maintained an active correspondence, couched in the language of an ill-concealed bitterness and of a somewhat supercilious virtue :—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>3</sup>*

Rufford, Feb. <sup>24</sup><sub>15</sub>, '80-1.

I had yours<sup>1</sup> the last post, and am glad to find by it that Sr Thomas Thynne hath stated my case, so as to set me right in your opinion. You know that, besides the perpetual employment I had whilst I was in town, I am naturally not very good at dilating half laziness and half honesty. I do not take so much pains to vindicate myself as perhaps a wiser man would do, and, being secure of your justice to me, I know you would take my word for my being an honest man, and therefore I thought it less necessary to enter into particulars of my defence. Things of this kind appear much greater to you at a distance than they do to us upon the place ; and it look'd much worse to you out of a very obliging reason to me, which was your being so kindly concern'd for me. I assure you I would say a great deal upon this subject, my heart being full of it ; but that between brothers it is hardly allowable to say the kind things one thinketh, because it looketh as if they could be doubted,

<sup>1</sup> March 6, *ibid.* p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> The biographer of James II. (*Life*, i. 653), on the authority of contemporary letters, asserts that Halifax rather favoured the Duke of Monmouth's readmission to Court, because it would serve as a convenient pretext for the recall of the Duke of York, which, although the Earl had always previously opposed it, he at length saw to be necessary, since the influence of the Duke could alone confirm the King's resolution. If this complicated plan were in agitation, it certainly came to nothing.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxxxvi., p. 178.

<sup>1</sup> Not extant.

which I dare say cannot be in our case of either side. I do not agree to the expedient you recommend to me for my fuller vindication. The president<sup>1</sup> you mention doth not come home to me. That lord, as he could pen an apology better, so he wanted it more than I do, for I assure you if I am a criminal I am an impudent one, and if you had been upon the place, you would have seen me much less out of countenance than those that pursued me. I think that I am not mistaken when I tell you the greatest part of them are far from being proud of what they have done as to my particular; for where a thing wanteth a true foundation in justice it cannot be long lived, let the authority be never so great that would give it countenance, and make it pass in the world. As for one thing you mention and set weight upon, there is no danger it should be imputed to me, whatever might be reported at first; I have made my thoughts publick enough concerning that matter; though after the things that have happened to me I will answer for nothing of that kind. As for any that have dealt ill with me from whom I had no reason to expect it, I leave them to the vengeance of their repenting thoughts, which must at one time or other represent their ungenerous proceeding in a worse and an uglier shape than either a vote or an address ever appear'd to me. I am now at old Rufford, where the quiet I enjoy is so pleasant, after the late hurricane I have escaped from in town, that I think myself in a new world, and if wishes were not vain things, and resolutions little better in so uncertain an age as this, I would neither intend nor desire any thing but what I have here silence and retreat; but if the Parl<sup>t</sup> sitteth at Oxford, by vertue of my peership, I am under the obligation of venturing once more to 'run the gantlet,'<sup>2</sup> and I am so ill at any undecent evasion of that which I think my duty, that if I should go about it I should do it very scurvily, which maketh me run hazards in these cases that more dexterous men would perhaps find means to escape.

I came through your corporation of Newark where I find you might be chosen preferably to any other pretender; but, having so good an excuse as a foreign employment, I suppose you will not lose it at this time. The quiet station you are in is not to be quitted to come into a storm, and thrust yourself into the difficulties that must always attend a courtier<sup>3</sup> who will be of the House of Commons. I speak against myself in this, since if you were there I should not only have a kind advocate, but a good one too to help me, if there should be occasion. Will you not let a man that is grown famous for giving ill counsell send you this short peece of advice, which in this changeable time

<sup>1</sup> Precedent.

<sup>2</sup> This is the true spelling, the original being 'gantelope,' a corruption of the Swedish 'gatlopp,' which means the 'running down a lane' (Skeat). Military deserters were frequently driven between a double rank of comrades, each of whom struck the offender as he passed. (See Christie's *Shuffesbury*, i. 81.)

<sup>3</sup> Savile still held a place in the Bedchamber.



1680<sup>80</sup><sub>81</sub> is not to declare yourself too positively of any party.' I do not mean to unfix your Protestantship; in that be as firm as you please, but in problems of state, where men may or may not be in the right, do not deserve the good opinion of one side so entirely as to forfeit your credit with the other. When you and I meet I can confirm this doctrine by an instance that you will not disallow. Adieu, yours.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

Rufford, Feb. 16<sup>th</sup>, '80-1.

I am a debtor for two of yours,<sup>2</sup> in one of which you send me Mr. Guy's apology, that is so much the more kind, as it was less necessary. I thought it justice to acquaint him with a report I had heard, and I must think it so too; to believe his denial in the manner he gave it: so that matter giveth no further occasion to enlarge upon it. I find my 'not guilty'<sup>3</sup> is a fault that groweth less with you, and that I am already half absolved in your opinion for my part in that business; if I know you aright, I think a little more time will undeceive you as much in the other parts of my charge, and rescue you from a mistake which the torrent of the times hath made so general, that I am too just to impute it as a fault to you.<sup>4</sup> When you write to our young man,<sup>5</sup> from whom I have not heard this good while, since your opinion agreeth with mine in it, pray encourage him to think it reasonable to look homewards. The changes made lately at court have removed some of your friends,<sup>6</sup> but those who are now thought to have the greatest credit<sup>7</sup> are I believe well enough inclined to continue all kinds of good offices to you; yet if at any time you can think, that at this distance, and in my present circumstances, it may be of use to you that I should say any thing concerning you, upon the least notice I am ready to obey. I continue in the resolution of going to Oxford, if the parl<sup>t</sup> meeteth at the time, the avoiding it being so scandalous, that the considerations of prudence are not to be admitted. In the mean time if your approbation of a calm and an easy life is not the effect of some sudden rapture, but a contemplation raised from a steady and deliberate thought, I could say more to encourage you to continue it than perhaps is fit to preach to a man in your circumstances, that is in the way of succeeding in a busy world, and it might look like betraying you to tempt you to the pleasures of ease and retreat. You are to take heed of Horace,<sup>8</sup> who, though he supp'd with Augustus at

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxlii., p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> Not extant.

<sup>3</sup> In the case of Lord Stafford.

<sup>4</sup> This suggests that Savile now inclined to the Exclusion.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Eland.

<sup>6</sup> Probably he refers to Sunderland and Godolphin.

<sup>7</sup> As Mr. Hyde.

<sup>8</sup> Aptly quoted by Savile in this connection (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 133).

[W. ?]<sup>1</sup> Chevins's, could not keep in a thousand sentences, of which every one well thought upon is enough to destroy not only the preferment, but the very calling, of a statesman or a courtier. You are not to hearken in this case to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely, and yet I lament with you from the bottom of my heart that there must be no mean between such brothers as use one another scurvily at home, and such who, though united by their kindness, are divided by different circumstances and employments, and instead of the pleasure of living under the same roof must be content with a kind absence, which is well, but it is absence still, whilst in the meantime we are forced to seek friends and company that grow in other soils, tho' perhaps not superior to what we might find in our own, besides the natural satisfaction of living upon what is of our own growth. I have sent your letter to our cousin Parson, and shall take care for a slender present to the nurse<sup>2</sup> when the time cometh. I am for ever yours.

*The same to the same.*<sup>3</sup>

Rufford, March 9<sup>th</sup>, '80-1. \*

I have yours of the 8th your style,<sup>1</sup> and return you the thanks of old Rufford for your favourable opinion of it; I concur with you so much that I assure you, with all its faults, I had much rather stay here than go to Oxford; but a man in my circumstances must either appear or give up, and, not being humble enough yet to do that, I am resolved nothing shall discourage me from doing the other. My discretion will be but a slender security, but what that wanteth I hope my innocence and good meaning will supply. How far your Charenton prayers will prevail for a man that is voted a promoter of popery I do not know, but I would not discourage your devotion let it be never so much misapply'd. I find I have raised your curiosity, and, which is a cruel thing, it is not time yet to satisfy it, for though there is somewhat of what you mention, yet you do not take all my meaning, and instead of explaining it, I would make you a proposition, which I think may be of use to you, if your circumstances will permit it; I would offer it to you to ask leave to come over for ten days, and it must be done immediately, because of the uncertainty of the continuance of the Parl<sup>t</sup>. The end of this is, that you may see and consider the scene now that it is changed, examine how many of your old friends deserve to be kept, and what new ones are necessary to be made, settle yourself in your master's mind, and offer some

<sup>1</sup> Conjectural emendation of the 'N.' printed by Mr. Cooper. James II. describes William Chiffinch, confidential favourite of Charles II., and first page of the back-stairs, as 'Mr. Chivin' (*Life*, i. 544); Lord Ailesbury calls him 'Mr. Chiffins' (*Memoirs*, p. 88); and the King's 'private suppers at Mr. Chivin's' were a focus of intrigue. Halifax evidently means that Horace was on familiar terms with Augustus.

<sup>2</sup> Probably Savile had been retained as sponsor to his cousin's child.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxlv., p. 189.

<sup>1</sup> Not extant.

16<sup>th</sup> antiodotes against the poison some may endeavour to infuse into it. You must not be so humble as not to think yourself big enough to be talk'd of,<sup>1</sup> and therefore it concerneth you the more to study the present map of the Court, that you may not take wrong measures, and, instead of making a progress, go back in the making your fortune. It is not possible to write the particular reasons, but I think if you can prevail with yourself to do it, it may be very advantageous to you. This meeting at Oxford is very criticall; there may be short turns and sudden changes, and in those cases it is very convenient to be upon the place. Do what you will, now that I have told you my opinion. Harry<sup>2</sup> telleth me he will be in Paris in April, where he shall find my letter to invite him over hither. I shall not protest your bill, but I hope you will acquaint Sr W. Coventry<sup>3</sup> with it, that I may be acquitted. I will press Mr. Hyde when I see him in your behalf, and I hope he will continue as you have ever found him, very kind to you. My wife and daughter send you their complements, and I am for ever yours.

All this time, as we find, opinions differed widely concerning the wisdom of the course pursued by Halifax in quitting London. Some<sup>4</sup> believed that the continuance of the same policy during his absence would abate the general belief in his excessive preponderance. Others<sup>5</sup> maintained that he would still bear the onus of counsels on which meanwhile he could no longer exert so direct an influence. We may very certainly conclude that his absence facilitated certain intrigues at Court, from which he was sedulously excluded. *Secret negotiations had been opened with France*,<sup>6</sup> which were quickened by the urgency of the Duke of York. The Duke despatched his confidant, Mr. Churchill,<sup>7</sup> to press upon his brother the necessity of his own recall and of a monetary treaty between the two Courts, which might enable Charles to dispense with his Parliament; and Churchill was further instructed to advocate the strengthening of the Prerogative,<sup>8</sup> and 'resolute Councils' in general. Churchill, however, carried his directions 'to be carefull how he communicats these

<sup>1</sup> See *Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 51 (York to Laurence Hyde, December 14) for a suggestion that Churchill may replace Savile if the latter have a mind to come home.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Eland.

<sup>3</sup> Who had assumed charge of Savile's affairs in his absence.

<sup>4</sup> As Newcastle. (See Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 202, January 26.)

<sup>5</sup> As Reresby himself (*ibid.*).

<sup>6</sup> Christie's *Shaftesbury*, ii. 402-3; Dalrymple, i. 362-71.

<sup>7</sup> Afterwards Duke of Marlborough.

<sup>8</sup> 'Matters were come to such a head that the Monarchy must be either more absolute or quite abolished' (*Life of James II.*, i. 659-60; from his own *Memoirs*).

*matters to My Lord Halifax, as not likely to enter into such measures.*' That Halifax was aware, however, of the fresh agitation for the Duke's return seems likely, for James asserts that although the Earl and Sir Edward Seymour acknowledged the desirability of the Duke's recall as favourable to continuity of policy, they continued to maintain that his presence in England could not 'be supported.'<sup>1</sup> 16<sup>30</sup>

No Englishman, however, with the exception of the Duke and Hyde was privy to the secret Treaty with France verbally concluded a few days before the meeting of the Oxford Parliament. The terms of this understanding were as follows: That Charles should gradually disengage himself from the newly formed Spanish Alliance; *should take measures to prevent Parliament from counteracting his engagements* (a very transparent euphemism); and should, in return, receive a sum of 3,000,000 crowns (about 150,000*l.*) in three annual instalments.<sup>2</sup>

It is with no desire to minimise the baseness of this discreditable intrigue (whereof, as we cannot too often repeat, Lord Halifax was entirely ignorant), and with a full realisation of the numerous very similar transactions in which Charles II. had already figured, that we point out how much the policy of the Exclusionists and of the Stadtholder<sup>3</sup> had upon this occasion contributed to their own despoite, by driving the English King from the anti-Gallican policy (which since the marriage of the Princess Mary he had more or less consistently pursued) into the arms of Louis XIV. Though it is possible, perhaps probable, that he would in any case have succumbed to the tempting proposals of France, the process was certainly hastened by the uncompromising violence of 'the Faction.'

Meantime, however, another project which had, on the contrary, the general sanction of Halifax came to maturity. This was a fresh 'Expedient,' which it was proposed to lay before the new Parliament, and which provided that on the death of Charles the Duke should

<sup>1</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 661.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 305, note 2; also Macpherson, i. 124.

<sup>3</sup> For the well-known and very impertinent interference of the States in the Exclusion question, already mentioned, see the *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* for January. D'Avaux (i. 125) says: 'Je ne sai si le Roi d'Angleterre, voyant que le Prince d'Orange, avec qui il avoit agi . . . avec la dernière confiance depuis la Paix de Nimègue, l'avoit mis à deux doigts de sa perte, ne se trouva pas obligé de prendre des mesures avec le Roi' (de France).

1689 indeed succeed to the title of King, but that the powers of government should be transferred to the Princess of Orange with the title of Regent.

This plan had been suggested shortly before the preceding dissolution. Burnet appropriates the credit,<sup>1</sup> and tells us that the idea originated in the course of a conversation with Sir Thomas Littleton.<sup>2</sup> Sir Thomas, he says, repeated the suggestion to Halifax and Seymour, who signified their approval; and, indeed, the design was usually ascribed to Halifax himself.<sup>3</sup> The King lent his authority, and the scheme really appeared to offer some hope of a compromise. It saved the King's point of honour, and was calculated to stifle the rather fine-spun scruples of the *Jure Divino* men. It assured the interests of the Prince of Orange as against the Duke of Monmouth; it was free from the Republican tendency charged upon the earlier 'Limitations;' while at the same time it practically conceded all that the most exacting Exclusionist had ever ventured to demand. It seemed, therefore, to promise a ground of meeting to all save Republicans and the direct adherents of Monmouth, and in particular hopes were entertained that it would sever the connection between the Exclusionists and William of Orange. With this object the 'Expedient' had been foreshadowed in an 'inspired' despatch<sup>4</sup> written by Secretary Jenkins on the very day of the dissolution. For that very reason the suggestion was, of course, utterly distasteful to the Sunderlands, and the Countess wrote with extreme bitterness of those 'very idle things called expedients.'<sup>5</sup>

The recess now drew to a close, and when, towards the end of March, Lord Halifax quitted the dignified seclusion of Rufford for the scene of bustle and excitement which had invaded the academic tranquillity of Oxford, he stepped, as it were, from a meditative twilight into the glare of a singularly dusty noon. The very roads which converge upon Oxford were thronged; excitement had reached fever-pitch; and the belief that the session must result in an appeal to arms seems to have been almost universal. The King had posted Lord Oxford's regiment along the London road, to secure, in

<sup>1</sup> *History*, edit. 1833, vol. ii. p. 276.

<sup>2</sup> An anti-Exclusionist member, and, like Halifax, a member of the old Country party.

<sup>3</sup> Dalrymple, i. 377; *Life of James*, i. 670.

<sup>4</sup> January 18, Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, second series, v. 472.

<sup>5</sup> Letter of January 25 to Henry Sidney (Blencowe, ii. 167). Her description of Halifax as 'a thing *nobody can depend on*' coincides with the classical definition of an 'independent' politician.

case of necessity, his retreat; many of the leaders, as if repairing to a Polish diet,<sup>1</sup> appeared armed to the teeth and followed by a crowd of retainers. The undergraduates had been prudently despatched to their respective homes; the Schools became, for the nonce, the Houses of Parliament; while the various colleges were occupied by the members and their servants. Baliol, where Lord Shaftesbury lodged, seems to have become the headquarters of the Exclusionist faction, and long boasted the possession of a magnificent silver-gilt bowl given by the heads of the party.<sup>2</sup>

On March 21 Charles opened the proceedings in a remarkable and statesmanlike speech. From the fact that it was published in London upon the day of its delivery it seems certain that it had been very anxiously prepared. The style, at once forcible and dignified—a marked tendency towards antithesis—and a general moderation of tone, create in the mind of the present writer a strong impression that the document had been at least submitted to Lord Halifax,<sup>3</sup> and had received his revision—a belief for which, however, we can adduce no external evidence. 'The unwarrantable Proceedings,' it began, 'of the last House of Commons were the Occasion of My parting with the last Parliament: *for I, who will never use arbitrary Government Myself, am resolved not to suffer it in others.* . . . It is as much My Interest, and shall be as much My Care, as yours, to preserve the Liberty of the Subject; because the Crown can never be safe when that is in Danger. . . . I let you see, by My calling this Parliament so soon, that no Irregularities in Parliament shall make Me out of Love with them; and by this Means offer you another Opportunity of providing for our Security here, by giving that Countenance and Protection to our Neighbours and Allies, which you cannot but know they expect from us, and extremely stand in Need of at this Instant.' The King's former assertions with regard to the Exclusion were next repeated, but were accompanied by a sufficient reference to 'Expedients' by which 'the Administration of the Government may remain in Protestant Hands.' Finally, the speech concludes: 'I may the more reasonably require that you make the Laws of the Land your Rule, because I am resolved they shall be Mine.'

<sup>1</sup> Hume.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* iv. 451. Even at service in St. Mary's the factions (to the scandal of pious men) sat apart (*Ailesbury Memoirs*, p. 54).

<sup>3</sup> It is far superior to the opening speech of the preceding session.

<sup>4</sup> *Lords' Journal*, xiii. 745. The italics are our own.

1681 Little can Lord Halifax have suspected as he perused, perhaps as he penned, this princely adjuration that the lying lips which endorsed it had already, in secret, renounced the Allies for whom they pleaded, and sold to a foreign Prince the assembly which they addressed !

The usual formalities of the occasion occupied the Commons for several days. In the House of Lords meanwhile<sup>1</sup> a Bill for the repeal of a penal statute directed against Protestant Dissenters<sup>2</sup> was formally re-introduced, since, strange to relate, the Bill of repeal which had passed both Houses during the preceding session had mysteriously disappeared at the moment when it should have received the Royal Assent. On the following day, upon the motion of Lord Shaftesbury, the Lords resolved to investigate this remarkable circumstance.<sup>3</sup> The Bill of repeal was then read a second time, and an immediate third reading seems to have been mooted : 'but my Lord Halifax desired it might be committed ; not that he was against the bill or the expediting the passing of it, but that it might pass with the more formality.' The Chancellor in an appropriate speech sanctioned the revocation of a law which, harsh in itself, had long been obsolete, and which in the case of a Papist sovereign might prove a dangerous instrument ; the Bishop of London, on the contrary, supported by his Episcopal brethren, strongly opposed the repeal, the Act being in his opinion 'the only means the Church had now left to free herself of schism.' Lord Shaftesbury retorted<sup>4</sup> 'he thought that this bill had been lost by a Court trick, to bring in a new way of a negative ; but now he saw it was partly ecclesiastical, since they had rather leave such a weapon to fall into Popish hands than the Church should lose it. The Lord Halifax said he could easily guess what that Lord would say ;' and that the Bishops . . . had given him great advantage by this opposition ; and he could not but wonder at it, and feared the whole nation would suspect them.' Yet when, twenty-four hours later,<sup>6</sup> the House in Committee elicited that Charles, upon the occasion in question, after consultation with 'a certain Lord' whose name did not transpire, had forbidden the Clerk of the Parliament to present the Bill of repeal,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> March 21.

<sup>2</sup> 35 Elizabeth.

<sup>3</sup> Locke to Stringer (Christie, ii. ; appendix, pp. cxi-cxv).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> I.e. had expected this retort.

<sup>6</sup> March 23, *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Fountainhall, the Scotch lawyer (*Historical Observes*, p. 31) remarks

Opposition opinion identified the anonymous adviser as Lord Halifax. This identification, however, appears the result of mere illogical malice. 1680<sub>81</sub>

Next day<sup>1</sup> it became known that Lord Danby, who had remained a prisoner in the Tower for nearly two years, was about to petition for his own release upon bail, on the plea of ill health. Lord Halifax allowed it to transpire that he should at the moment oppose the motion, which he considered inopportune, but was prepared to support it if deferred until after the crucial debate in the Commons. The friends of Lord Danby persisted. Lord Halifax joined forces with the Opposition; and declaring that the motion appeared designed to make a breach between the Houses and ruin the King's business, that the petition should rather have been for trial, that the method pursued was improper, and that the Commons should be first consulted as to their readiness to proceed with the impeachment, he succeeded in postponing the question, until the ensuing Monday.<sup>2</sup> Owing to circumstances upon which we shall presently dilate, this amounted, in the event, to an indefinite postponement.

In the House of Commons<sup>3</sup> meanwhile the Exclusion question had immediately pressed to the fore, but by great efforts the direct motion was evaded and the debate referred to the succeeding Saturday, at which time, as was understood, the Expedient suggested in the King's speech would be broached by its supporters.

But on the Saturday,<sup>4</sup> before the opening of the eventful debate, a very remarkable interview between the King and Lord Shaftesbury took place within the precincts of the House of Lords. The Earl adverted to the King's expressed intention of securing the Administration to Protestant hands, in the event of his brother's succes-

that the Repeal Bill contained a clause banishing all the principal Roman Catholics, including possibly the Duke of York. This explains the King's opposition. The accounts of the Repeal Bill (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, pp. 214, 269) give no details. The Commons also discussed the same question March 25, and demanded a conference with the Lords, which took place on the 26th. The Lords' managers included eight leading Exclusionists, Lord Halifax, and two or three courtiers. Monmouth reported, but proceedings fell with the dissolution.

<sup>1</sup> March 24.

<sup>2</sup> All this is from the correspondence between Lord Danby and his son, printed in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv., part 9, pp. 421-31. Danby's letter on p. 421 should be March 25, not March 23. Lord Danby is inclined, of course, to charge Lord Halifax with personal malignity in the matter (p. 428); but this seems unlikely, in view of his offer given in the text. The debate is also mentioned in Locke's letter, quoted above.

<sup>3</sup> March 24.

<sup>4</sup> March 26.



1681 sion ; and upon this hint directly advocated the advancement of the Duke of Monmouth. Barillon<sup>1</sup> and others have represented this as a bid for the Duke's elevation to the Throne, but certain considerations<sup>2</sup> suggest that they laboured under a misapprehension, and that Shaftesbury, having received intelligence of the Regency project, desired that Monmouth should be preferred to the Princess of Orange in the capacity of Regent. Whatever his proposal, this public mention of the young Duke excited great comment ; and although the retort of Charles was immediate and decisive, the incident was regarded as a proof of an increased political importance.

The crucial debate in the Commons took place immediately afterwards. Littleton and Meres, Ernely and Legge, developed the Regency scheme, by which the Duke of York was to be banished for life,<sup>3</sup> the Government being vested in the Princess of Orange, and, in case of her death without issue or leaving issue under age, in 'the Princess Anne.'<sup>4</sup> But in the event of the Duke having a son educated a Protestant, such Regency, it would seem, was to last till the date of his majority only.<sup>5</sup> To the Regent, we find, the power to nominate the Privy Council, with or without the approbation of Parliament, was assigned. Opposition to the Regent would thenceforth rank as treason. The immediate imposition upon the Prince and Princess of Orange and on all officials of an oath of loyalty to these provisions was directly contemplated, and efforts were to be made, under Royal sanction, to

<sup>1</sup> See the remarkable despatch in Christie, ii., Appendix, p. cxvi ; also *ibid.* ii. 408, 409 ; and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 9, pp. 83, 84 (account by Lord Worcester, who handed the paper to the King, but who does not say that he had read it) ; and North's *Examen*, p. 100, where the incident is absurdly ascribed to 1683.

<sup>2</sup> The suggestion that the proposal sprang from the offers in the King's speech, and the fact that Monmouth treated the incident with indifference. In the *Dutch Despatch (Open)* of April 17 we are told with reference to Limitations, that some said Monmouth must be called to administer the Government (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 51. (See also Lord Conway's suggestion on p. 291 below.)

<sup>3</sup> It seems unlikely that Charles had sanctioned this part of the scheme.

<sup>4</sup> These Articles are abstracted from the pamphlet entitled *A Seventh Collection of Papers, &c.* (Richard Janeway, London, 1689), p. 3 : 'The Heads of the Expedients proposed by the Court Party, to the Parliament at Oxford, in lieu of the Bill for excluding the Duke of York.' A similar List of Provisions is given in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xv., part 2, p. 321, from a paper in the Hodgkin collection. The authenticity of these abstracts, however, is not beyond cavil. The *Dutch Despatch (Open)* of April 17 mentions a paper which seems to be identical, but adds that the propositions were never actually made, though discussed privately (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 51).

<sup>5</sup> 'Which obviates an incurable Absurdity in the former Bill of Exclusion' (original pamphlet).

secure the co-operation of the Scotch and Irish Parliaments. If the event of the Duke's return the provisions of the Exclusion Bill were, so it was arranged, to become law. All considerable Papists were to be banished by name, means being taken to defeat their fraudulent conveyances and secure the education of their children in the Protestant religion.<sup>1</sup> 1681

In the House of Commons these suggestions were very badly received. Secretary Conway believed that a similar scheme, with Monmouth as Regent (the plan, as we understand it, patronised by Lord Shaftesbury), would have taken with the House; but this is pure and, we think, unsupported conjecture. Most of the members were pledged to the Exclusion, and perhaps believed that the progressive offers of the Court would terminate in surrender. It appeared doubtful whether James and his adherents would acquiesce in a scheme so far-reaching, collision between him and the Regents seemed almost inevitable, and stress was laid upon the Constitutional advantages which his title must, under such circumstances, confer upon the nominal king.<sup>2</sup> Before separating, the House resolved to pursue the policy of Exclusion.

Lord Halifax seems to have desired that the House of Lords should await the advent of the Exclusion Bill, and, suffering it to lie upon the table, while renewed efforts were made for a compromise, defer the final rejection.<sup>3</sup> It is therefore probable that the King's immediate resolution was taken without the knowledge or sanction of the Earl.<sup>4</sup> During the intervening Sunday, indeed, Charles II. made no sign; but on the Monday, availing himself of the pretext afforded by a quarrel between the Houses, he suddenly dissolved,<sup>5</sup> and ere the members had recovered from the stupor of astonishment he was at Windsor.

Previous to his departure, however, Lord Halifax had obtained an audience, in the course of which the Earl

<sup>1</sup> 'By these means these three Kingdoms will be united in defence of the Protestant Religion, his Majesty's Person and Government, and a sure Foundation laid of an effectual League with Holland, and consequently with the rest of Christendom, in opposition to the growing Greatness of France' (original pamphlet).

<sup>2</sup> See Burnet, ii. 277.

<sup>3</sup> Macpherson, i. 116.

<sup>4</sup> Luttrell, i. 72. It is not clear whether Halifax attended the 'Cabinet Council held on Sunday at the Lord Chancellor's lodgings in Merton College' (*Ailesbury Memoirs*, p. 56).

<sup>5</sup> While dissolving he significantly observed to Lord Bruce: '[You are] now a better man than [I was] a quarter of an hour since; you had better have one king than five hundred' (*Ailesbury Memoirs*, p. 57; conjecturally emended).

1681 recommended Sir John Reresby to his Majesty's favour,<sup>1</sup> and, it is very possible, further extracted from the Sovereign a promise that the Duke of York should not be summarily recalled.<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax then introduced Sir John to Laurence Hyde, from whom the Baronet desired some personal favour, and left that same evening for Bibury, near Oxford, Sir William Coventry's place, having first despatched the following letter to his brother:—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

Oxford, <sup>March 29,</sup>  
April 8, '81.

I have just now received yours, and would not have thought it necessary to return so quick an answer to it, but that I conceive it proper to acquaint you that this morning the Parl<sup>t</sup> was dissolved after having sat only a week, but there were such foundations lay'd for heat and dispute, that the King thought it advisable to part with them. Things of this kind are sure to have comments made upon them, and it is not proper at this distance to enlarge upon this subject, so that you must be content to reserve the satisfying your curiosity till you come over, for w<sup>ch</sup> I would have ask'd leave here, but that your letter came some time after the King went to London, and Mr. Hyde with him; but I will send to him to move the King for leave, and, though I shall not perhaps be in town when you come, intending to return to Rufford, yet I hope you will have time enough allow'd you to contrive how we may meet: in the mean time Mr. Hyde telleth me he hath lately supply'd you with a quarter's payment, and as things are now in the Treasury you must be content to be in some arrear. If you come over, I suppose money will be less necessary to you than it would have been if you had gone to Bourbon, which you will not think of if the French Embassadour informeth me right, that the K. of France hath put off that journey. I am so interrupted that I cannot make this any longer, and am just going to Bibury to give a visit to S<sup>r</sup> W. Coventry. Adieu.

<sup>1</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs* (1875), p. 211. He had seen a good deal of Halifax while there, who 'told me his thoughts with great freedom.' Reresby considered the Earl 'as much in councils as before, but he would not be known to be so.' Sir John adds, he heard from Halifax '*and others*' that Charles would maintain his brother's cause *and call no Parliament for a long time*. This hint he may have had from Hyde, who knew of the French treaty.

<sup>2</sup> Macpherson (i. 120) states this distinctly, quoting the *Memoirs* of James.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxlvi., p. 191.

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII

*Essential Clauses of the Exclusion Bill.*<sup>1</sup>

An Act for securing of the Protestant Religion by disabling James Duke of York to inherit the Imperial Crown of England and Ireland, and the dominions and territories thereunto belonging. Whereas James Duke of York is notoriously known to have been perverted from the Protestant to the Popish Religion, whereby not only great encouragement hath been given to the Popish party to enter into and carry on most devilish . . . plots . . . but also, if the said Duke should succeed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, nothing is more manifest than that a total change of Religion within these kingdoms would ensue; . . . Be it therefore enacted. . . . That the said James Duke of York shall be and is . . . excluded and made for ever incapable to inherit . . . the [said] Imperial Crown. . . . That . . . if the said James, Duke of York, shall at any time . . . claim . . . any . . . authority . . . within the said kingdoms . . . he . . . shall be deemed and adjudged guilty of high treason. . . . And further That [his abettors] . . . shall be deemed and adjudged guilty of high treason . . . And . . . That if the said James, Duke of York, shall at any time from and after the fifth day of November . . . [1680] return or come into . . . any of the kingdoms or dominions aforesaid, That then he . . . shall be deemed and adjudged guilty of high treason. . . . And further that . . . [his abettors] . . . shall be deemed and adjudged guilty of high treason. . . . And . . . that the said . . . Duke . . . or any other person being guilty of any of the treasons aforesaid shall not be capable of . . . any pardon otherwise than by Act of Parliament, wherein they shall be particularly named . . . Provided . . . That nothing in this Act contained shall be construed . . . to disable any person from inheriting . . . the Imperial Crown . . . aforesaid (other than the said James, Duke of York), but that in case the said James, Duke of York, shall survive his own Majesty and the heirs of his Majesty's body, the said Imperial Crown shall descend to . . . such person and persons successively during the lifetime of the said . . . Duke . . . as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the said . . . Duke . . . were naturally dead.

<sup>1</sup> Abstracted from the original engrossment, as printed in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 2, p. 195 (papers of the House of Lords).

## CHAPTER IX

IN THE GOVERNMENT, 1681-85

## PART I. PRELIMINARY : AT RUFFORD, MARCH-MAY 1681.

1681 AT Bibury Lord Halifax, as we learn, met his cousin Sir John Lowther, and his friend Sir William Hickman, both members of the Oxford Parliament. From his host, Sir William Coventry, himself the Earl must have received full sympathy, for the Knight had strongly desired a reconciliation between the opposing parties, and deeply regretted that the reckless violence of the Opposition had neutralised the conciliatory efforts of the Court.<sup>1</sup> The friendly confabulation broke up on April 4,<sup>2</sup> when Lord Halifax retired to Rufford, where he proposed, as we gather, to remain. In point of fact he stayed there some six weeks, and the ensuing letters belong to this interval of repose :—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

Rufford, April <sup>9th</sup><sub>10</sub>, '81.

I am come home again sooner than I expected, though I made my stay from hence some days longer by a visit to our friend at Bibury. I have not yet received the letter you have sent by a French gentleman, and therefore had not writ now, but that just now Mr. Hyde sendeth me word leave is given you to come over,<sup>4</sup> of which I suppose you will have notice before this cometh to you ; so that I am only to wish you a good journey, and to put you in mind that, besides the necessity there is for many reasons that I should see you before you return, old Rufford is not content with your commendations alone, but expecteth a visit from you. If Harry should come to Paris before you leave it, pray encourage him to come along with you, for there are some reasons that make it con-

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Coventry to Sir Thomas Thynne, April 4, April 15, May 2 (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* April 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxlvii., p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> There was about this time a rumour of his eventual recall (*Lady Sunderland to H. Sidney*, March 28 [*Blencowe*, ii. 185]).

venient for him to be here as soon as may be. Hoping to see you ere long, I will not add any more but that I am ever yours. 1681

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

April <sup>20</sup>/<sub>80</sub>, '81.

If you have kept the resolution you had when you writ last, this will find you at London, from whence if you come out next Monday, and that your kindness will bring you half way hither, I do in the name of Rufford desire you will make the whole journey, let your stay here be never so short. I do not stand upon any forms with you, but it would just at this time be more inconvenient to me than ordinary to stir from hence; and that your journey may be the less uneasy to you, if you will send me word by the next, my coach shall wait for you at Colesworth, the time you will appoint it. If Harry had not been very slow in his motion from Italy he might have been time enough at Paris to have come over with you. My wife and daughter send you their complements, and I am ever yours.

*The same to the same.*<sup>2</sup>

Rufford, April <sup>30</sup>/<sub>May 10</sub>, '81.

This is only to congratulate your arrival and to thank you for the hopes you give me of seeing you here, and of bringing your nephew with you; If S<sup>r</sup> T. Clarges continueth in the disposition of making me a visit, he will perhaps be tempted to hasten it by the invitation of having so good company as yours. I need not tell you how big I am with the expectation of such a kind meeting: that which is more necessary is to put you in mind of sending before to me, to let me know where and when you would have my coach wait for you. The women return you their complements.

Pray make my L<sup>d</sup> Clare<sup>3</sup> a visit, and excuse that which he thought an omission in you formerly.

The following epistle from the celebrated divine, who died Archbishop of Canterbury, throws some light on the situation of the moment:

*Dean Tillotson to the Earl of Halifax.*<sup>4</sup>

London May 3d 1681

My Lord I waited yesterday upon M<sup>r</sup> Savile to acknowledge his great favours to my friend M<sup>r</sup> Nelson<sup>5</sup> upon your L<sup>o</sup>s recommendation, for which I most humbly thanke your L<sup>o</sup><sup>p</sup> I believe M<sup>r</sup> Savile will be at Rufford almost assoone as this Letter, who will give yo<sup>r</sup> L<sup>o</sup><sup>p</sup> a better account of affaires here

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cxlix., p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* letter cl., p. 194.

<sup>3</sup> He had married a sister of Lady Halifax.

<sup>4</sup> *Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 41.

<sup>5</sup> See *ante*, p. 249.

1681 then I can. We are at present so taken up with the mysterious busines of Fitz-Harris' that we talk of nothing else, though no body knowes what to make of it. . . . Our friends came very warme from Oxford and not a little dissatisfy'd with your Lo<sup>p</sup> about the rejecting of their impeachm<sup>t</sup>. Last Saturday I had some discourse with a Friend at Grays Inne concerning yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>p</sup> towards whom I found him much more calme then he hath been since I saw yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>p</sup>. I am, as I have great reason, most heartily concern'd for yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>p</sup> and sorry to heare any thing said to yo<sup>r</sup> disadvantage, though yo<sup>r</sup> retirement hath in a good measure silenced that sort of talk.<sup>2</sup> One thing extremely troubles me, that the different apprehensions of wise men about the meanes of our safety hath left us open to that danger w<sup>ch</sup> ought some way or other to have been provided against.<sup>3</sup> I despaire of seeing yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>p</sup> here before winter, and therefore could not forbear to enquire of yo<sup>r</sup> health w<sup>ch</sup> I pray God to continue. I am

My Lord

Yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>p</sup> most obliged

and obedient Servant

JO. TILLOTSON.

*The Earl of Halifax to Laurence Hyde (Lord Hyde).<sup>1</sup>*

Rufford, May 4th, 81.

I do very willingly comply with Sir Ralph Knight's desires ; I would recommend him to your Lordship. His case is so just, that if the Exchequer is in a condition to hear reason, he cannot fail of succeeding in that he pretendeth to ; and, indeed, if any exceptions are to be admitted to the strict rules you have made, perhaps there is hardly any body that deserveth more to be distinguished. The short of his business, as he representeth it

<sup>1</sup> A disreputable informer, whose complicated intrigues had given rise to the quarrel between the Houses which had been the pretext for the dissolution.

<sup>2</sup> Not entirely, however. The declaration, in which Charles defended his action in relation to the recent dissolutions, appeared April 8. The celebrated answer, *A Just and Modest Vindication* variously ascribed to Jones, Algernon Sidney, Somers, and Robert Ferguson—inimutes that the authors of this declaration, which the writer severely criticises, are identified by the enumeration, among the crimes of the Westminster Parliament, of *Votes against Particular Persons*. 'There was no surer way,' adds the pamphlet, 'of entitling oneself to the favour of the Court than to receive a censure from the representative body of the people.' Yet, so runs the argument, the dismissal of unpopular Ministers is no exorbitant request ; nor would a 'final dissolution of all things' have necessarily ensued, even upon the removal of 'my lord H. himself.' We do not know whether Halifax is the 'person well known without naming him, who always tells men they have done themselves no right, when he is resolved to do them none ;' but it is certain that the expression 'to do right,' in the sense of *justice*, occurs frequently in his letters. How far Lord Halifax really countenanced the declaration cannot be traced ; Sir William Coventry approved it (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>3</sup> He means that neither Exclusion *nor* Limitations had been carried.

<sup>4</sup> *Clarendon Correspondence* (Singer), i. p. 57. Hyde had been created a Peer about a week before. (See Narcissus Luttrell, *Diary*, April 22, p. 77.)

to me, is, that he lost in employments and land 900*l.* per annum. 1681  
 When the King came in, for a compensation to him there was given him 600*l.* a year for ever.<sup>1</sup> Some years since he sold this to the King for 8,000*l.*, which was all paid excepting 600*l.*, for which he taketh a tally, and sendeth it to the Exchequer, the breaking of the bankers<sup>2</sup> involveth him amongst the rest. Now, considering how much he did towards bringing in the King, and how well he is disposed to keep him in, which he expresseth fully upon all occasions, if something might be done for him without any consequence to others, I should think it would not be ill bestowed; he is not pressing for the time, but if he may by any means be secured to have what is due for him, he is willing to wait as long as your Lordship shall judge to be reasonable. • I know that offices of this kind are not generally very welcome to you; but I do not only hope you will forgive, but, upon second thoughts, thank me for putting you in mind of doing a piece of justice, where it will be so well applied. I am ever yours.  
 HALIFAX.

The friends of Lord Halifax seem to have regarded it, as a settled thing that his retirement should be of substantial duration.<sup>3</sup> He held, we remember, no office—had never, indeed, held any such; and the influence which he had exerted over the policy of the country had been employed in the modest capacity of a Privy Councillor. There was nothing therefore to detain him in town or to compel his attendance at Court; and his advisers evidently hoped that by relapsing into private life, until another Parliament should meet, he would consult his own interests, and avert the dangerous hostility of the Exclusion party. Far otherwise was the actual event. About the middle of May,<sup>4</sup> and, as it would appear, upon a sudden resolution, Lord Halifax returned to London.

The original motive for this step we cannot determine. The plans of his brother<sup>5</sup> may have affected his own; on the other hand, Lord Hyde<sup>6</sup> had urged in the strongest manner his return, and it is just possible that he received

<sup>1</sup> Sir Ralph Knight seems to have been a colonel under Monk and a confidant in the Restoration intrigue (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 6, p. 5).

<sup>2</sup> On the stop of the Exchequer in 1672.

<sup>3</sup> See Tillotson's letter above, and Sir William Coventry to Sir Thomas Thynne, April 4 (*Longleat MSS.*): 'I thinke (by the folly of those who might have bin wiser) our friend's affaires come to a pretty good posture; if hee can bee contented w<sup>th</sup> the best seat and the greatest plenty of any man in England, time will doe much to heale his scarrs, and perhaps hee may acquire a greater value, and bee the brighter for rubbing.'

<sup>4</sup> Reresby, *Memoirs* (1875), p. 214.

<sup>5</sup> Who returned at the end of May precipitately to his duties, in consequence of rumoured aggressions on the Netherlands frontiers, to which attention will soon be drawn (Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd ser., v. 500, 504).

<sup>6</sup> Halifax 'note book,' Devonshire House: (Lord Hyde) 'May 17. 81. sayeth, for God's sake my L<sup>d</sup> come up, or you will not find mee here.'



1681 a special summons from the King. His Majesty, we gather, was anxious to confer with Lord Halifax as to the desirability of the Duke of York's return from Scotland, since Charles had deferred his decision on the subject with the expressed intention of consulting the Earl.<sup>1</sup> This delay and its occasion were equally offensive to the impatient Duke, who already resented the 'excessive credit' which the Earl, in his opinion, enjoyed; and who frequently animadverted upon the 'timourous' nature of his counsels, and the unsatisfactoriness of 'men of expedients' as a class.<sup>2</sup> The political situation, moreover, was further complicated by the sudden development of an alarming Continental crisis; but it is more than doubtful whether, in this department, Charles II. desired to enlist the political services of Lord Halifax. That the Earl's visit, by whatever occasioned, was in its origin merely temporary, and gradually assumed the proportions of a settled residence in town, may be inferred from the letter to his brother with which we commence a new period.

PART II.—'FIRST MINISTER,' MAY 1681 MARCH 16

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>3</sup>

Windsor, June 26,  
July 6, '81.

I am in debt to you for yours<sup>4</sup> since your arrival at Paris, and deferred my answer in hopes I might have given you some account of my L<sup>d</sup> Windsor's treaty with his friend for your place, but it seemeth he desireth some more time to consider of it, which must not be refused, because too much pressing might make you have the worse bargain. Your letters were read yesterday to the King and approved, but I may spare the pains of mentioning particulars, having seen my L<sup>d</sup> Hyde's letter, where, besides the information he giveth you concerning y<sup>r</sup> business, telleth you at the same time how much a moral reflection of yours was applauded first by our master, and then by all the company; you may see by this, we have a conceit left still, notwithstanding the condition of Christendome, and the late election of the sheriffs.<sup>5</sup> Mr. Fitzharris is to suffer next Friday.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 62 (May 24); *Life of James II.* i. 681.

<sup>2</sup> The Duke of York to Legge (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, pp. 57, 60; *Life of James II.*, ii. 677).

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clvi., p. 202.

<sup>4</sup> Not extant.

<sup>5</sup> Which had been unfavourable to the Court interest.

<sup>6</sup> Lord Halifax was to some extent implicated in the investigations regarding this obscure intrigue. (See the examinations, *Grey's Debates* ix. 182). Ralph describes Halifax as the patron of Fitzharris (i. 597) merely it would seem, because he was the leading statesman at the moment.

My L<sup>d</sup> of Kingston is come over and sayeth he had seen you, 1681  
but you were gone to Versailles; but that which will be the  
greatest news to you, my family is coming up this week, and I  
must lose the joy of being in the country now that the rain hath  
made it so delicious. Adieu.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

July <sup>11th</sup>/<sub>21</sub>, '81.

You guess right that I am likely to stay in town, my family  
being now come up, which maketh me dispair of seeing Rufford  
again this summer, though the late fine weather maketh me  
lament the being kept from it. Thus we small implements of  
state are abridged of the common liberty other men have, and  
yet are hated and envied instead of being pitied for it. My L<sup>d</sup>  
of Kingston stay'd in town but two or three days, went to his  
grandfather in Wiltshire, and without returning hither cross'd  
the country to go into Nottinghamshire. I am glad of my  
cousin's preferment if the match goeth on with my L<sup>d</sup> Thomas  
Howard,<sup>2</sup> who in my opinion standeth fair to be Duke of Nor-  
folk. It may be a tender thing for me to be a trustee,<sup>3</sup> being at  
this time under such a character,<sup>4</sup> but when I know of what  
nature it is I will either agree to it or give a good reason why I  
cannot. Your letters were read yesterday at the cabinet councill,  
and your proceeding approved concerning my L<sup>d</sup> Hamilton,<sup>5</sup>  
with directions to you what to do further, of which Mr. Secretary  
Jenkins will give you an account. I have gratify'd our young  
men<sup>6</sup> abroad by sending for them home, and expect them the  
latter end of the summer. Our occurrences are all sent to you,  
so that I will not repeat them, and if I had anything more to  
say to you I am just now interrupted. Adieu.

Curious to relate, indeed, five years elapsed before  
Lord Halifax again saw Rufford. Circumstances con-  
spired and forced upon him a Ministerial responsibility,  
which, as we may certainly conclude, he was not very  
loath to assume; so that from the moment of his arrival

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clx., p. 206; '[16]80' is a printer's error.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Cooper refers to Tierney's *Arundel*, ii. 553-562, for information  
that Lord Thomas, Master of the Robes to James II., drowned at sea  
November 9, 1689, married Mary Elizabeth, heiress of Sir J. Savile, of Copley.  
His eldest son succeeded an uncle as Duke of Norfolk in 1701, and was suc-  
ceeded by his brother Edward, who died in 1777; both were Papists.

<sup>3</sup> He means, considering the fact that the family was Papist.

<sup>4</sup> He alludes to the vote which had declared him a friend of Popery.

<sup>5</sup> Who, while ill in Paris, had been persecuted by a proselytising priest;  
Savile had behaved with great spirit in the matter.

<sup>6</sup> His younger sons. They had been studying at Geneva under the  
charge of a M. Marquis. His letters contain a most amusing account of an  
attempt on the part of the University authorities to confer upon 'Mr. William'  
the highest honours in their power, on account of his rank. He, with his  
tutor's concurrence, magnanimously declined, unless he should prove first in  
the examination, in which attempt he failed (MSS. at Devonshire House).

1681 in town, till the return of the Duke of York in the following March, Lord Halifax, though in official rank a mere Privy Councillor, was regarded as the 'entire favourite,' the 'chief favourite and minister.'<sup>1</sup> His predominance, however, was rather apparent than effective; for despite his acknowledged ability, the services he had rendered the Government, and the external deference these extorted, there were underground influences at work by which his sagacious counsels were perpetually neutralised.

Before considering the details of the period in question it is necessary that we should take stock of the existing situation. The dissolution of the preceding March had marked the beginning of a new era; the ascendancy of the Exclusionists had reached its climax; the reaction had set in. The violent and arbitrary conduct of the two last Parliaments had strained national sympathy to breaking point. Men saw how narrowly a civil conflict had been averted; they remembered the Long Parliament and its termination; and they reflected, in the words of a remarkable pamphlet<sup>2</sup>—often, though, we think, erroneously, attributed to Halifax himself—that the tyranny of many is even more insupportable than the tyranny of one.

The popular voice, which had applauded the violence of the Exclusion party, now turned, with a zeal equally exaggerated, to the Court side, and an unreasoning fanaticism was succeeded by a loyalty as extreme. The new 'Tories,'<sup>3</sup> as they were derisively termed, were as little to the taste of Lord Halifax as the Exclusionists whom they supplanted, and upon whom party animus bestowed the name of 'Whigs;' nor did he pretend to conceal his scorn and disgust for the excited memorialists who overwhelmed the now triumphant Administration with servile congratulatory addresses.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Beresby, July 7, September 13, pp. 215 and 218. See also Lord Latimer, June 29: 'Lord Halifax and Conway are very great, and Seymour. They have been very diligent in their attendance and are in [the King's] closet twice or thrice a day' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv., part 9, p. 435).

<sup>2</sup> The *Seasonable Address to both Houses of Parliament*, which appeared immediately before the Oxford session. (See the question of its authorship discussed at large in the *Works of Halifax*.) The tract ran through at least five editions in the course of the year.

<sup>3</sup> The word first appears (in the correspondence of Lord Halifax) July 27 of this year. Most of the Nottinghamshire gentry, writes his cousin, Sergeant Millington, are 'high Tories, wearing little red Ribbons in their hats' (*Spencer MSS.*, box 31, bundle 38). Millington is mentioned in *Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 66.

<sup>4</sup> 'I think I understand y<sup>r</sup> opinion of addresses,' writes Sir William Hickman on July 13, 'and y<sup>r</sup> L<sup>th</sup> does the same of mine' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [36]). According to Burnet, the opinion of Lord Halifax was conveyed

The extent of this revulsion was further shown by 1681 the circumstances of an event which took place on July 2. Upon that day Lord Shaftesbury, charged with treasonable conspiracy against the Government, was arrested ere he had left his bed, and committed (after examination before the Council) to the Tower; but his apprehension, which a few months earlier would have set the country in a flame, aroused a very modified excitement. This strategy was very generally ascribed to the influence of Lord Halifax,<sup>1</sup> and he was even charged with attempts to suborn evidence against the prisoner.<sup>2</sup> From

with more force than elegance 'in a saying that was much repeated: he said, the petitioners for a parliament spit in the king's face, but the addressers spit in his mouth' (ii. 284). Lord Halifax, however, did not invariably declare himself with this directness. As here-by on August 20 wrote, the Duke of Newcastle pretended 'to have been informed that y<sup>e</sup> L<sup>d</sup> endeavor'd to hinder ye Nottin<sup>m</sup>shire address, w<sup>h</sup> I told him y<sup>e</sup> Lord<sup>m</sup> was soe far from, that I see y<sup>e</sup> much concerned for fear y<sup>e</sup> Endeavours of his Grace in that perticular should miscarry' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [13]).

<sup>1</sup> This view derives apparent confirmation from a valuable paper printed\* in Christie's *Shaftesbury*, vol. ii., Appendix, pp. cxviii-cxxii; but this document, as we shall show, Mr. Christie has misdated by six months. A letter in the *Hutton Correspondence* (ii. 5) says, August 2, 'I heare y<sup>t</sup> my L<sup>d</sup> Shaftesbury is very confident he shall turn y<sup>e</sup> batterie upon my L<sup>d</sup> Halifax; but it's good to ride y<sup>e</sup> fore hors.' An interesting attack on Lord Halifax, from the 'Whig' point of view, is given by Ralph (i. 637-8, note) quoting a contemporary pamphlet: 'Nor do some of those who are so violent in the Prosecution of my Lord Shaftesbury much magnify their Wisdom. . . I am sure a certain Person, within these seven Years last past, declaim'd against the Court and the Ministers, with as little Respect and Decorum in what he said, as he doth now against the two last Parliaments. . . If the Earl of Shaftesbury be guilty of anything against his Majesty, it is in having been so unhappy as to have heard him spoken of with too much Disregard and Undervaluation by a certain Gentleman, that now glories in having the chief Superintendency of his Affairs. . . It hath been long observ'd, that they who, in Matter of Religion, wheel off from one Party to another, are the . . . most implacable Persecutors of the Side which they relinquish'd; but I never heard till now, but Men might see Reasons to change Measures in Politics, without being for sacrificing those that cannot shift about to the several Points of the State compass, as the Wind of Court-favour may happen to sit. Besides, who knows but that the Witnesses, whom some Persons do so tenderly embrace and cherish, in order to the ruining of my Lord Shaftesbury and others, may not, . . . when a Parliament comes thoroughly to inspect this Affair . . . load others with Guilt? Besides, were my Lord Shaftesbury and a few other Persons of Quality once destroy'd, how easy will it be for some whom I forbear to name, to crush those that are now so instrumental in their Ruin? There is a certain Gentleman in the North (Duke of York?) 'as well as one' (Lord Danby?), 'if not more, in the Tower, who have Memories tenacious of old Injuries. . . For by how much they would be thought great and generous, by so much will they prove the more averse to pardon such as have allowed themselves to speak of them with Contempt, and in a Language near to Ridicule.' (See also *Growth in Popery*, part ii., quoted by Ralph.)

<sup>2</sup> See Christie, ii. 415-17, 419-421; Burnet, ii. 293, and the evidence in relation to Halifax given as an Appendix to this chapter. Against the Solicitors to the Treasury the charge, one regrets to say, seems to have some foundation.

1681 this preposterous accusation it is scarcely necessary to defend him, and we presume that even the arrest of his uncle, though attributed to the counsels of Lord Halifax, followed, as a matter of course, upon the depositions. The assertion of Halifax, that evidence sufficient to hang the accused would be produced against him,<sup>1</sup> refers, it would seem, to the magnitude of the charge rather than to the credibility of the witnesses, which, indeed, Lord Halifax, by inference, subsequently disparaged;<sup>2</sup> and in the following passage from a letter to his brother, dated August 11,<sup>3</sup> he appears to disclaim all responsibility for the proceedings. 'I must first tell you,' he says, 'the world abroad maketh both my L<sup>d</sup> Shaftesbury and myself much greater men than we are, and draw inferencies from the success of things one way or other that are not bound to follow. The matter is not so criticall as they apprehend it, and I will only tell you that I am far from thinking either the King or those near him to depend so much upon the event of this matter as it is represented to you at this distance: so that I have none of those inward disquiets you might reasonably suppose, if I took myself to be so nearly concerned.'

The approbation of Lord Halifax seems less probable, because, in point of fact, conciliation, as opposed to terrorism, was the keynote of the policy which he desired to recommend. Anxious above all things to counteract what in modern days would be called the spirit of reaction, he continued to urge that the King should employ his regained ascendancy with a moderation which might at once ensure its continuance, secure the popular voice, and contribute to the satisfaction of the sagacious minority, which deprecated with extreme urgency the perpetuation of existing feuds.<sup>4</sup> Such counsels, however, naturally

<sup>1</sup> *Reresby's Memoirs* (1875), July 7, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* November 6, p. 223, where Shaftesbury's release is described as an act of mercy and legality.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> See an interesting letter from Sir William Hickman to Lord Halifax, August 3 (*Spencer MSS.* 41 [36]): 'My most deare L<sup>d</sup>, I doubt, indeed, things are in that height, as writing, and arguments has little effect in the conversion of any, but I doe not despare, but thers yet roome for good and cleare actions w<sup>ch</sup> is ye onely meanes of convincing, I wish I could see anything tend towards a healing (w<sup>ch</sup> I am sorry is so remote a contemplation) I beleive there may be some y<sup>t</sup> are not desirous of it, but I am satisfied the Body is inclined to embrace all opportunity of reconciling, w<sup>ch</sup> is ye thing in the world I desire most, and am glad y<sup>r</sup> L<sup>th</sup> continues in the same minde to doe y<sup>r</sup> part w<sup>ch</sup> will give you a greatnesse as' (?) 'durable and truly valuable.' On August 27 he adds, 'I am glad y<sup>r</sup> L<sup>th</sup> hopes well, I am assured of y<sup>r</sup> meaning well.'

embroiled him with the violent 'Tories' and the Duke of York, their avowed champion, and we are not surprised to find that Lord Halifax showed every disposition to keep the Heir-Presumptive at a convenient distance. For some weeks, however, the Duke of York saw more reason to approve the conduct of Lord Halifax than was often the case. If the Earl obstructed, and with success, the Duke's immediate recall, he declared with equal decision against the readmission of the Duke of Monmouth to favour, which had been proposed as a counterpoise; and he advised the postponement of Parliament until even beyond the ensuing winter.<sup>1</sup> The Duke's confidence in his sincerity improved; <sup>2</sup> but he still conceived Lord Halifax as less favourable to his return than any other of the 'cabinet Council;' and when in August he once more requested leave for a visit, if only of some days' duration, the negotiation was deliberately concealed from Lord Halifax. A letter inadvertently shown by Lord Conway betrayed the intrigue, and Lord Halifax did not affect to disguise his annoyance. He wrote immediately to the Duke himself,<sup>3</sup> assuring him that nothing could be more unwellcom to him in the world than to have the honour of his commands, and at the same time the misfortune of thinking it not for his Highness's service that they should be complyd with. The influence of Lord Halifax once more decided the King: permission was again refused; and, moreover, Lord Hyde was despatched to the North on a special mission peculiarly distasteful to His Highness.<sup>4</sup> By his instructions Lord Hyde was directed to inform the Duke that his return to Court must be contingent on his conforming to the Protestant faith. Hyde was empowered to hint that in case of obstinacy it might become impossible to support the Duke further, and to promise that if his Highness would but yield so far as to attend the services of the Church of England he should be at once recalled. Hyde, who despite the favours he enjoyed at the hands of the Duke,<sup>5</sup> remained a staunch

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 62; *Life of James II.*, i. 681, 682. Hyde and Scymour, who were also consulted, concurred. It is not clear to whom we must assign the suggestion that James upon his return must needs take some part in business, if only in order to countenance those who had recalled him; surely not to Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> He seems to have expressed a favourable opinion of the Minister early in August (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 66).

<sup>3</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 698, 699.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i. 699-701; James to Legge (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 67). This was about the beginning of September.

<sup>5</sup> His brother-in-law, be it remembered.

1681 Anglican, pressed this expedient from his heart ;<sup>1</sup> and Lord Halifax, at whose instance the attempt had probably been made,<sup>2</sup> wrote with the utmost uncompromising plainness.<sup>3</sup> He said,<sup>4</sup> 'That all the good part of England, seconded My Lord Hide's errand with their wishes, and thō it was a tender point which no one durst venter to press home, yet he could not hould (out of the abundance of his zeal for his prosperitie) from assuring him, he should think it a greater miracle than had happen[ed] since the Apostles time,<sup>5</sup> to wether the storme which his enemies had rais'd against him, without takeing away the armes he had put into their hands ; that the hopes of this, had been hitherto the support of his friends, and preserved them in his intrest, but that if once they dispair'd of it, he must expect all men would desert his cause, as they would a towne that could no longer be defended, and that his enemies would triumph for a victory not of their gaining, but his giving.'<sup>6</sup> Such expostulations—which to the credit of James,<sup>7</sup> be it said, were absolutely futile—afford some warrant for the rather caustic epigram of Frederick Maurice, 'that the Halifaxes . . . of the seventeenth century . . . thought it very absurd to kill for a faith . . . but quite as absurd to die for one.'<sup>8</sup>

Meanwhile the domestic exigencies of the moment, serious and engrossing as they appeared, were both complicated and intensified by an acute European crisis. The Continental situation, as already intimated, had become strained to the last degree ; and the precarious and troubled peace which had existed since the signature of the Nineguen Treaty, some three years before, seemed on the verge of collapse through the tacit encroachments of France. Her intrigues upon the borders of the Spanish

<sup>1</sup> And was seconded by Legge, another of the Duke's Protestant favourites.

<sup>2</sup> See Burnet (ii. 312), who only knew of the affair by rumour.

<sup>3</sup> See *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 67.

<sup>4</sup> The abstract is from the *Life of James*, i. 700, where there is a marginal reference to the original letter, which was among the papers of James II. destroyed in the French Revolution.

<sup>5</sup> Is this a sneer at Popish miracles ?

<sup>6</sup> See Lord Halifax's own account of this letter (Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 244) ; it quite tallies. Two letters from his cousin Lord Strafford to Lord Halifax, urging a similar attempt, are later in date—September 17, October 15, 1681 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [21]).

<sup>7</sup> He answered 'that then his case was more desperate than he understood it to be before, for that he could not alter his principles' (Reresby, p. 244 ; *Life*, i. 699).

<sup>8</sup> *Macmillan's Magazine*, August 1860.

Netherlands, and of Germany,<sup>1</sup> had long excited the re- 1681  
sentiment and alarm of Spain, Holland, and the German  
Princes; but it was in immediate contemplation of a  
further and more daring aggression that Louis, by the  
secret compact of March 22, 1681, had secured the prac-  
tical neutrality of England.<sup>2</sup> The English King, during  
the course of that clandestine negotiation, had indeed  
attempted to stipulate for the inviolability of the Spanish  
Netherlands, and even of Strasburg: but his astute  
accomplice had returned an evasive answer; and the  
pecuniary terms of the arrangement were calculated to  
neutralise as far as possible the scruples of the English  
King. The next move was immediate: simultaneously  
with the conclusion of the treaty, which, as we are  
already aware, practically coincided with the opening of  
the Oxford Parliament, the French monarch advanced his  
claims upon Luxembourg, into the dependencies of which  
Duchy his troops actually entered. About the time that  
Lord Halifax reached London the pretensions of France  
to Chimay were boldly flaunted,<sup>3</sup> and the position of  
Charles became one of acute embarrassment. Hampered  
on the one side by the terms of the secret engagement, by  
his pecuniary transactions with the French Court, and by

<sup>1</sup> A good account of these encroachments will be found in the *Œuvres de Louis XIV.* iv. 191-3.

<sup>2</sup> Concluded verbally between Barillon, Charles II., and Hyde. It seems advisable to translate at length Hume's report (edition of 1848, vi. 225, note), taken from the French archives: 'Verbal agreement concluded April 1 A.S., 1681. Charles II. agrees that he will neglect nothing which can justify the confidence reposed in him by His Most Christian Majesty; that he will extricate himself gradually from his alliance with Spain; and that he will take measures to counteract all pressure on the part of his Parliament which may be inconsistent with the fresh obligations he is on the point of assuming. In return the Most Christian King engages for a subsidy of two million crowns during the first of the three years for which the engagement is to last, and five hundred thousand crowns for the remaining two, relying on His Britannic Majesty's assurances that his relations with His Most Christian Majesty shall be answerable to the extent of his indebtedness. Mr. Hyde demanded that the French King should bind himself to make no attack upon the Low Countries, or even upon Strasburg; pointing out, that even if Parliament should not meet, it would be impossible for his master to refrain from affording assistance to the Netherlands: M. Barillon, by order of the French King returned a general answer, to the effect that His Most Christian Majesty had no intention of breaking the peace, and would not involve His Britannic Majesty in measures prejudicial to his true interests.'

<sup>3</sup> See *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* of <sup>March 25</sup><sub>April 1</sub>, 1681, and *Despatch (Open)* of <sup>March 22</sup><sub>April 1</sub>. The *Dutch Despatches (Open)* for this year will be found in vol. FF of the British Museum transcripts (Add. MSS. 17,677); the *Secret Despatches* are in vol. SSS.



1681 a strong disinclination to become once more dependent upon the precarious liberality of a Parliament; impeded on the other side by the formal alliance with Spain, contracted a year before, Charles II. could only expostulate both in public<sup>1</sup> and in private with the representatives of his French confederate, while endeavouring by the most profuse professions<sup>2</sup> to avert suspicion, and thus stave off the clamour of his Dutch and Spanish allies.

The anxiety of the Prince of Orange, in the meanwhile, became extreme. He was well aware how seriously his position at the English Court had been impaired by his injudicious alliance with the Exclusionist party; while at the same time he was still of opinion that 'only by an adoption of the Exclusion policy could Charles effect a reconciliation with his people, which might enable him to render effective assistance against France. The Stadtholder desired Henry Sidney (who, at this very moment, in consequence of his Exclusion sympathies, had been recalled in disgrace) to consult his friends in England upon the desirability of a visit from the Prince, which might, he hoped, exert a mollifying influence upon the mind of Charles.

Sidney reached London on June 22, dined with Hyde and Halifax next day, and on the 25th had a second interview with Halifax, during which the Minister discussed the situation.<sup>3</sup> On July 28 Sidney wrote a long letter to the Prince,<sup>4</sup> in which he gave his own version of the situation at Court: 'nobody hath any credit but the Duke's creatures . . . My Lord Halifax is greatly incensed against the House of Commons, and must stick to the Court (for he hath not a friend anywhere else) and is therefore obliged to comply sometimes against his inclination.' Sidney said both to him and to Hyde that he believed some in the 'Cabinet Council' were desirous of a quarrel between King and Prince; but both protested, and he believed with truth, that they could not 'imagine there was such a villain, and such a fool too, amongst them, for it would not only destroy this nation and all the royal family, but all Europe.' Halifax in especial made 'great professions of his being entirely in your interest, and said you were the only foundation one could build upon. That what he had done last winter was to carry on your interest, and for his part he would never think of any other.'

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 208.

<sup>2</sup> *Dutch Despatches*, April-August.

<sup>3</sup> Blencowe, ii. 207, 208.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 212-219; also printed by Dalrymple.

Incidentally he observed that he thought the Prince's visit might be of use; and 'solemnly promised' to 'do his best' in the Prince's favour, especially as regards the rescinding of a recent appointment distasteful to William (that of Skelton as Envoy to The Hague), though 'as to that matter, all was resolved of before he came to town.'<sup>1</sup> 1681

Eventually the proposal was made in due form, and by July 9 Charles had consented. The Prince reached Windsor on Saturday, <sup>July 21</sup> ~~August~~.<sup>2</sup> On the Sunday, about four o'clock in the afternoon, he had a conference with the King, which lasted two hours, and was resumed next morning in the presence of Halifax, Hyde, and the Secretaries.<sup>3</sup> The Prince urged the precarious situation of Flanders, and the absolute necessity that England should intervene on the side of the Allies. All knew that a Parliament was the inevitable preliminary: and the Prince was asked how he proposed to meet the difficulties which must ensue, if the Parliament, as appeared probable, should insist upon the demands of its predecessors? Was he prepared to advocate the Exclusion—'Limitations'—the disgrace of the Ministers in power? He disclaimed all such intention. When asked for an alternative policy, he begged leave to confer with whom he pleased on the subject; returned to London; and opened communications with the Exclusion leaders, trusting that he might prevail upon them to assume a more conciliatory attitude. Von Ranke states, without quoting the source of the information, that several of the chief men were prepared, in the event of an immediate session, to make provision for the security of Flanders, while declining all the disputed points of domestic policy; but that Russell, at whose house the meetings were usually held, and who, in the absence of Shaftesbury, must have exerted an almost supreme influence over the party, proved inexorable, and the negotiation consequently collapsed. Upon other

<sup>1</sup> Both Halifax and Hyde thought the Prince's letters 'too high and sharp' in tone, and advised 'a more gentle style' in addressing the King.

<sup>2</sup> For this visit see Luttrell; *Life of James II.*; *Dutch Despatches*; Macpherson, i. 125, 126, 131.

<sup>3</sup> 'Being among the chief of those who at present manage affairs' (*Dutch Despatches* [*Open*], August 5, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 906).

<sup>4</sup> Macpherson's *Extracts*, p. 125; *Life of James II.*, i. 691. North, quoting a Memorial of his brother, asserts that Orange attempted to persuade Charles to make war upon France, in the bare hope that the States would follow his example. As Ralph says, this sounds rather incredible. It is, however, of course certain that there was a large party in Holland desirous of peace at any price, and that the Prince's urgency was not universally shared. He may, therefore, have desired to force the hand of the States.

1681 authority,<sup>1</sup> it has been stated that the Prince (no doubt on the failure of this negotiation) pressed the King to yield to his people, not without an insinuation that other compliances, additional to the Exclusion, might be requisite. Such suggestions were naturally unpalatable; and the Prince, during a subsequent visit to London, having accepted, at the instance of Lord Russell, and despite the remonstrances of Halifax, Hyde, and Seymour, a formal invitation to dine with the City magnates (the very incarnation of Exclusionist sentiment), he found himself, at the instance of the Ministers, peremptorily recalled to Windsor.<sup>2</sup>

His urgency, however, with that of the Spanish Ambassador, produced some result. Halifax, Hyde, Seymour, and the Secretaries were appointed Commissioners; and a conference took place<sup>3</sup> between these Ministers and the Spanish Ambassador, in presence of the Dutch Representatives, of which the particulars were subsequently reported to the King and Prince. The remonstrances of the Spaniard, and his demands that the States and England should intervene for the protection of the Netherlands, evoked from the Commissioners the 'frank' response 'that the king their master was much dissatisfied with these proceedings, and considered them most unjust, and of very dangerous consequence; that he was inclined to consider of ways and means whereby the King of France might be diverted from his present designs: but that he was specially desirous that all such instances might be as far as possible conciliatory and calculated to avert the fears of a European conflict.' As the Ministers, however, maintained that the King had absolutely determined to act in complete sympathy with the States, and to do his utmost on their behalf, the Dutchmen took immediate advantage of their friendly professions, and Charles found himself compelled to promise (1) that he would join the States in a strong remonstrance against the unwarrantable usurpations of the King of France; and (2) that he would assist

<sup>1</sup> Memorial in North's *Examen*, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Macpherson, i. 126; *Life of James II.*, i. 691, 692; *Dutch Despatches* (*Open*), <sup>July 29,</sup> August 8, and August <sup>12,</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, ff. 92, 94; *Hatton Correspondence*, ii. pp. 4, 6.

<sup>3</sup> August <sup>1,</sup> (Macpherson, i. 126-7; *Life of James II.*, i. 692; *Examen*, p. 474; *Samle Correspondence*, pp. 217-18; *Dutch Despatches* [*Secret*], August <sup>2,</sup> <sub>12,</sub> British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. SSS, f. 406; D'Avaux, i. 166).

<sup>4</sup> We use the language of the *Dutch Despatches*, though it is certainly inapplicable to Hyde.

in garrisoning, if necessary, the denuded fortresses of the Spanish Netherlands. His Majesty declined, indeed, to assist the Spaniard with troops, until a formal declaration of hostilities should have taken place between the disputing Powers; and in so doing he stood, no doubt, within the letter of existing engagements; but he gave an explicit pledge to the effect *that in case of an actual invasion upon the Flemish frontier he would forthwith summon his Parliament and openly break with France.* Upon this assurance the Prince (August 1<sup>st</sup>) left for Holland. His visit had effected, in at least one direction, a salutary result, since it doubtless facilitated relations as regards the Prince and Lord Halifax,<sup>1</sup> between whom, we imagine, a coldness had been created by the intrigues of the Sunderland group. An active correspondence soon originated.

The presentation of the proposed remonstrance meanwhile was delayed during a period of some weeks, and in the interval the correspondence of Halifax with his brother Henry, through whom it was to be delivered, is mainly of a personal nature:—<sup>2</sup>

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>3</sup>*

London, July 28,  
Aug. 7, '81.

I have yours by S<sup>r</sup> R. Mason,<sup>4</sup> and have seen that which you wrote to Secretary Jenkins,<sup>5</sup> and they both afford considerable matter of reflexion, and for what you direct more particularly to myself I need not tell you how kindly I take it; and, though perhaps my suspicions may not be altogether so strong as yours, yet sure there is ground enough for me to have my cautions, being under such circumstances as I am, and having enemies of so many several colours, I know no better expedient to secure myself against all events than to build upon the same foundation and live by the same maxims I have ever done since my being in business, and to take care that in all my actions there may be so much of the Protestant and the Englishman as may silence the objections of my being a papist

<sup>1</sup> 'I am well pleased' (wrote Sir W. Hickman, August 3) 'you are so well satisfied in ye P<sup>ty</sup> of Orange's coming' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [36]). On the other hand, the Duke of York professed much satisfaction with the conduct of Halifax on this occasion (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 66).

<sup>2</sup> As the private concerns of Savile become occasionally tedious, we shall relegate some portions of these letters to the notes.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clxii., p. 211.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Cooper's note says: 'One of the commissioners for the office of Master of the Horse, and in February 1685 one of the Clerks Comptrollers.' The letter to Lord Halifax is not extant.

<sup>5</sup> The able despatch of July 12<sup>th</sup>, given in *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 207-211.

1681 or a pensioner.<sup>1</sup> In particular I shall endeavour to justify my Protestantship by doing all that is in my power towards the encouragement of those that shall take sanctuary here out of France;<sup>2</sup> though even in that, our present condition consider'd, there is great tenderness to be used in the manner of it, that we may give no occasion for a higher persecution against them there, or by disputing a prince's power over his own subjects draw a question upon us which would hardly be decided in our favour, and we are not strong enough to support our having the wrong end of an argument. Upon this occasion I must give you a hint to be wary in your expressions, without abating any thing of your due zeal for religion; for instance, in one of yours to the Secretary you took occasion, from the translation of Plunket's speech into French to say somewhat,<sup>3</sup> which, if your memory can recollect, your judgment will scarce allow upon second thoughts. Your letters<sup>4</sup> . . . . . is going with his family into France; and, as a piece of more surprising news, it is said now very confidentially that 'Tho. Thynne' hath got my Lady Ogle.<sup>5</sup> The Prince of Orange is here, and speaketh of you very kindly. His stay will be very short, but long enough to inform himself better of our affairs than he could have done by receiving his lights from the best of his correspondents.

I thank you for your notes concerning Mr. M., which I received by Coll: Sackville.

*The same to the same.*<sup>7</sup>

Aug. 10, '81.

You will have another from me by this post; since when, I am told by S<sup>r</sup> R. Mason somewhat more particularly than he express'd himself at our first meeting, that one of your chief arguments to press for a higher character is that it may recommend you to a considerable match. You say nothing of this in your own letter,<sup>8</sup> which maketh me suspect it may be out of his superabundant friendship, that he might alledge all possible inducements for your obtaining what you pretend to; but in my judgment, if you have any hopes of this kind, the lady will be as well encouraged by a good lasting establishment here in England as by a (*sic*) such a transitory preferment as that of an embassadour, and therefore I will presume you can be in no hazard

<sup>1</sup> Le. a pensioner of the French Court, such as, for instance, Sunderland. Mr Cooper says Fitzharris had preferred this charge against Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> This had been a main object of the despatch.

<sup>3</sup> See Mr. Cooper's note.

<sup>4</sup> Half the letter is missing.

<sup>5</sup> Of Longleat (cousin to Sir Thomas).

<sup>6</sup> The heiress of the last Earl of Northumberland, of the original stock. Her mother, the beautiful Lady Northumberland (Henry Savile's old flame), was half-sister of Rachel Lady Russell, and had remarried with Ralph Montague. (She, and not the Countess of Manchester, is the lady referred to in *Savile Correspondence*, p. 251, note.) The young lady bore the title of Ogle in consequence of her childish contract with the Duke of Newcastle's only son, the deformed boy whose death in 1680 Lord Halifax mentions.

<sup>7</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clxv., p. 215.

<sup>8</sup> Not extant.

of losing your interest in her, if you have any, for want of a 1681  
circumstance that hath nothing substantial in it. I would not  
venture to use this argument to the King upon the bare  
authority of S<sup>r</sup> Richard Mason, besides that I apprehend it  
might be liable to be turn'd to raillery, which I did not think  
seasonable whilst I was very serious in moving in your behalf.  
This I thought fit to mention to you, having omitted it in my  
other letter.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

London, Aug.  $\frac{11}{2}$ , '81.

I wrote by way of advance, being to go to-morrow early to  
Hampton Court, without being sure of returning hither time  
enough to write to you. I have yours<sup>2</sup> by S<sup>r</sup> W<sup>m</sup> Jennings,<sup>3</sup>  
whom I met going to Windsor; <sup>4</sup> . . . To your next paragraph,  
I will say no more than that I am never likely to be a French  
pensioner further than another kind vote may make me, so  
that I must set down with the honour of such a noble character  
without the aim of ever being the richer for it: in the mean-  
time your part to me is so kind, that I must encourage you to  
continue it as often as you have the occasion, and I assure you,  
the hints you give me shall stay in my thoughts, so that I do  
not doubt but they may be very usefull to me. My former  
told you your informations concerning S<sup>r</sup> John Chicheley were  
wrong, and before I conclude you will be further satisfied; for  
upon your last proposal, in which you seem so earnest, where  
you desire an addition of character, and for very good reasons  
relating to the publick, and the dignity of the crown, besides  
the arguments that may concern yourself in it, I moved the  
King, my L<sup>d</sup> Hyde being present, and without disallowing your  
reasons, it is not thought fit to be done, from the argument of  
expence, which perhaps might have been over ruled in this  
single case if it had not been urged that this would be a pre-  
cedent to send embassadours to other places, which would lay a  
burthen upon the treasury it is not at present in condition to  
bear. This being so, I thought fit to represent to the King that  
I was sure he was too gracious to you, and too well satisfied  
with your service, to let you lye under such a mortification as  
this might perhaps be to you, and that if the uneasiness it  
might bring upon you should make you desire to return home,  
y<sup>r</sup> coming would look like a disgrace; except you had the  
countenance of some other imployment to secure you from any  
such misconstruction. Then putting him in mind of the Admi-  
ralty, he presently fell into it, and said he would make a new  
commission where you and S<sup>r</sup> John Chicheley should be taken  
in; he spoke it in a manner that I think you may rely upon it

<sup>1</sup> *Sarile Correspondence*, letter clxvi., p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> Not extant.

<sup>3</sup> A witness (says Mr. Cooper's note) against College; eventually, having  
followed King James II. to France, he took a command in the French navy.

<sup>4</sup> Here follows a passage concerning Lord Shaftesbury, already given *ante*,  
p. 302.

1681 It is yet a secret, and so you are to treat it ; my opinion is, you should immediately take notice of this to the King, and desire to be recall'd that you may give him thanks, and serve him here, for I conclude you will judge this a more desirable thing than the tinsell of an embassy ; besides it will ease you of a thousand difficulties and vexations the present posture of things abroad must necessarily throw upon those that are imploy'd in them. Adieu.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

London, <sup>Aug 25</sup><sub>Sept 1</sub>, '81.

I have been slower in answering your last<sup>2</sup> from Paris from the hopes I had to have got before this a letter from the King himself to you, which he hath promised, but you know it is not very easy to prevail with him to keep his time upon such occasions. Your continuing to be so earnest for an addition of character, though against my own opinion, made me move again in it, but you over-value my power if you think I have enough to carry this point, for though there's all the disposition you could wish to gratify you as to your own particular, the objections against what you desire are so rooted in the King that they are not to be removed. The next thing to be done is to engage him to secure you a place in the Admiralty, when a change is made there, which will be done in a little time ; and I think you may reckon yourself to be very secure of it by his repeated promises, which he will confirm further to you by his own letter, in which he will assure you that it is no want of kindness for you if he doth not comply with your request. I cannot say I am at all convinced by your arguments, but that hath not kept me either from wishing or endeavouring you might have your desire, which shall be reason enough to me in most cases ; but since it falleth out so that the King is positively fixed not to admit of your pretension, I will assure you, if you will allow I can guess well for you, I am far from being sorry for it, for your sake and in your consideration wholly, having no interest of my own to biass me, though your offer is very kind to dispose yourself to wave all other arguments, if I apprehend you might be useful to me here. There is nothing of that in the case, but upon viewing your present circumstances, and foreseeing what may probably happen to you in the station where you are, I should not think it an unreasonable advice to you to leave it, even without the prospect of any thing here ; but the argument is much stronger from the assurance you have of being admitted into a place which, with what you have already, will enable you to live to your satisfaction. It is true you have by your absence avoided some difficulties ; but it is as true, that as things are likely to play you would have more difficulties where you are than you can probably have here, especially when

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clixviii., p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> Not extant.

fixed in so quiet a station as that of the Admiralty; and there- 1681  
 fore I confess I cannot but give it you as my opinion, that as  
 soon as you shall have the King's letter, which I will endeavour  
 to hasten to you, you should ask leave to come over presently,  
 and so by making it your own act avoid any interpretation  
 which might be to your disadvantage, of leaving your employ-  
 ment, and prevent the dissatisfaction of remaining in it upon  
 terms that make it uneasy to you. Your reception here will  
 be such that you will be in no danger of having your return  
 look like a disgrace, and, though the King is under circum-  
 stances and engagements that you cannot be put in singly into  
 the commission at this very time, yet you may be sure nobody  
 shall be put before you, and, if I do not mistake extremely, the  
 thing may probably be done for you and Sir J. Chicheley  
 together in a very little time after your return, so that you are  
 not to look upon it as a matter of solicitation, but a thing that  
 will come to you naturally and without pains or disquiet in the  
 obtaining it. The money you mention shall be ready for T.  
 Robson when he calleth for it. I take this opportunity of writ-  
 ing by my L<sup>d</sup> of Dorset, who is going over to you. My L<sup>d</sup>.  
 Vaughan<sup>1</sup> and Sir Cyril Wyche<sup>2</sup> go along. They are your  
 good friends, and yet let me give this caution, that as some men  
 may hurt by betraying, others may by commending.<sup>3</sup> I may  
 perhaps preach more care to you than I practice myself,<sup>4</sup> but  
 it is because I think your circumstances may more require it.  
 The King cometh from Windsor to morrow. I must not forget  
 to tell you that H. Guy is of my mind in what concerneth  
 you. Adieu.

It is supposed the Dutch Embassadour will not follow the  
 court to Lyons or Chambert,<sup>5</sup> and then your doing it would be  
 of no use, but of expense, an article much considered here at  
 this time.

The proposed memorial now begins to dawn upon the  
 diplomatic horizon:—

*The same to the same.*<sup>6</sup>

London, Sept. 1<sup>st</sup>, '81.

Since I writ by my L<sup>d</sup> of Dorset, I have yours<sup>7</sup> of 28 Aug.  
 new style, from Fontainebleau, by which I find you are not

<sup>1</sup> Eldest surviving son of Richard, Baron Vaughan (Earl of Carbery, in the peerage of Ireland).

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Cooper's note says: 'Secretary of Ireland 1692 under Lord Sidney, and died Jan: 1707 (Luttrell's *Diary*).'

<sup>3</sup> Vaughan at least was an active Exclusionist.

<sup>4</sup> This probably hints at an intimacy between Halifax and Vaughan, who, a year later, married the latter's daughter.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Cooper's note says the Chambert proposal was only a feint: the King started from Fontainebleau on September 30 [N.S.] for *Strasbourg*, which M. de Montclar was about to invest. (See also Savile's letter of September 23<sup>rd</sup> October '81 *ibid.* p. 225). The Queen and Dauphine repaired to Nancy.

<sup>6</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clxiv., p. 221.

<sup>7</sup> Not extant.



1681 disposed to come over presently<sup>1</sup> . . . your inclination being to stay where you are for some time, it will be the less necessary the King should write to you,<sup>2</sup> . . . I hear of the adventure which hath lately happened to you,<sup>3</sup> though I wonder there are no letters from you concerning it; by the account that is given by the French embassadour, your servants are absolutely justified, and the fault lay'd where it ought to be, besides that the King of France resolveth to pursue the offenders with all severity, and to do every thing else that may give you entire reparation in all kinds. I come now from the Spanish Embassadour's, where we have had a conference<sup>4</sup> with him and the Dutch Embassadour concerning a joint memoriall to be presented by you and the Dutch Minister at Paris, and in a little time it will be drawn up and sent to you.

*The same to the same.*

London, Sept. 7, '81

You will receive by this post<sup>5</sup> from Mr. Secretary Jenkins a memorial agreed upon here by the Spanish and Dutch Embassadours,<sup>7</sup> and to be delivered jointly by you and the Dutch Minister<sup>8</sup> to the King of France. I believe you will

<sup>1</sup> 'but choose rather to stay with the character you have, notwithstanding the mortification you receive by it, concerning which I might say a great deal to convince you of the mistake if you apprehend it to be any diminution to yourself; but I will now only tell you, that you are too well known, and have been too well approved, to have any such consequence drawn from it. To return to the matter, —'

<sup>2</sup> ' . . . to give you a handle of coming over presently, so that I shall not sollicit him any more in it, except you tell me you would have it, and then I will take care to procure it: in the mean time I think you are secure that nothing will be done in the commission of the Admiralty to your prejudice, and I cannot but take notice of the mistaken information you have had concerning St John Chicheley, which may be a caution to you hereafter not to be too apt to believe upon such occasions. I am glad the pretensions that were hinted to me by St R. Mason are so remote that you are not likely to receive any prejudice by the disappointment you had in the request you made here, which, as I have told you before, you are to place in the catalogue of your good fortunes, if I am not very much mistaken. There shall be care taken when the time cometh concerning that which you mention of due precedence in the commission, and in the mean time you are not to imagine that so unkind a thing can be done to you as to send over another with a greater character, when you have been refused it. . . '

<sup>3</sup> A fatal encounter between his servants and those of the Duc d'Elboulf. (See Mr. Cooper's note.)

<sup>4</sup> *Dutch Despatches* (*Secret*), September 12, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888, p. 410.

<sup>5</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter clxx., p. 223.

<sup>6</sup> It had been completed a few days earlier (*Dutch Despatches* [*Secret*], September 11, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888, p. 110).

<sup>7</sup> Drafted by Halifax and another, and substituted, in consequence of assurances on the part of Barillon, for an earlier draft prepared by the Dutch and Spanish Ambassadors. The *Dutch Despatches* describe the memorial as in full accordance with the wishes of the States, being couched in terms the most civil and acceptable, yet forcible and significant withal (*ibid.*).

<sup>8</sup> The Prince of Orange had urged a joint memorial; Savile disliked the

judge that in the condition we are in it is fit to use a gentler style than might be proper if we were stronger; and therefore, our circumstances considered, it cannot be expected we should have said more, and perhaps the prince you have to deal with may think we have said too much. It seemeth there is a precedent for this method of a joint memorial, the same having been done by Monsieur Van Beuninghen and Sr John Trevor. I have seen the account you give of your own adventure, and as your proceeding is approved here, so I do not doubt but the King of France will do you exact justice according to the strictness of his own nature as well as his method of governing, so that probably some of the offenders may be prefer'd to the gallows: in that case I thought it no disservice to you to move the King you might have full power to intercede for them, or let them alone, as you should judge most reasonable, or as you find yourself disposed to return the civilities of the house of Lorraine to you upon this occasion. Whilst I am writing, yours of the 9th<sup>1</sup> cometh to me, by which I find you are not inclined to interrupt the course of justice; however it can do no harm to have it in your power. The King went this morning to Newmarket. I don't know whether it will be news to you that my L<sup>d</sup> Hyde went 4 or 5 days since<sup>2</sup> into Scotland.<sup>3</sup> I hear you have got a good match for Mr. Poulteney, and on the other side Bernard Howard tells me you have made his kinsman your irreconcilable enemy. Adieu.

*The same to the same.*<sup>4</sup>

London, Sept<sup>26</sup>  
Octr<sup>6</sup>, '81.

I have not yet been at Newmarket, though I think I could not have escaped it any longer, if I had not a very scurvy reason to excuse me, a small indisposition that maketh me unfitt for a journey, especially when I have so little mind to it.<sup>5</sup> Last night I saw your letter to Secretary Jenkins, which mentioneth the delivery of your memorial;<sup>6</sup> in your last you seem'd to be of opinion it was not seasonable at this time,<sup>7</sup> but if you had seen the importunity of the Spanish Embassadour here, and which is more of the Prince of Orange, who writ quarelling letters because it was not despatched,<sup>8</sup> I am persuaded you would as we do conclude it was unavoidable, and

course, from which he anticipated no good result (*Sarile Correspondence*, p. 223, note from a letter of Secretary Jenkins).

<sup>1</sup> Not extant.

<sup>2</sup> September 7, (*Dutch Despatches* (Secret.)).

<sup>3</sup> On the proselytising errand already mentioned *ante*, p. 304.

<sup>4</sup> *Sarile Correspondence*, letter clxxi., p. 228.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Halifax, who cared nothing for horse racing, disliked Newmarket.

<sup>6</sup> Probably the letter of September 21, October 1, *Sarile Correspondence*, p. 224.

<sup>7</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 223, note.

<sup>8</sup> Domestic affairs (the Shrieval election, &c.) had caused some delay in September (*Dutch Despatches*).

1681 by what I can see, it is still more justify'd by the late proceedings of the French at Courtray,<sup>1</sup> besides Casal<sup>2</sup> and Strasbourg,<sup>3</sup> that must help to rouse the world out of their sleep: though in the distracted condition the confederates are in it may be doubted whether it is not now too late for them to do anything towards their security.

My young men will have nothing to do when they have paid their duty to you but to make haste home, where I am preparing a lodging at Mr. Foubert's for George;<sup>4</sup> and Will: I think must go to the university, but I will not absolutely determine that till I see him.<sup>5</sup> I am interrupted, and can add no more but that I am yours.

A somewhat grim interest attaches to the Earl's correspondence with Lord Hyde, aware as we are of the secret engagements between the Kings, in which the latter was implicated:

*The Earl of Halifax to Viscount Hyde.*<sup>6</sup>

For the Lord Viscount Hyde, at Newmarket.

London, Sept. 27, 1681.

I had so great a mind to follow you, that, as it usually happeneth, I am disappointed in it; my distemper, though somewhat abated, yet still continuing so much that I do not know how to venture upon a journey: but to supply my place you will have the Spanish ambassador, who goeth full of complaints, for which you are to prepare yourself. He is resolved to try again about Portugal, a business so rooted in his head, that neither Strasbourgh, Casal,<sup>7</sup> nor Luxembourg, can put it out of his head. I think, if you could persuade the King to speak plainly to the French ambassador concerning what is passed at

<sup>1</sup> Where a conference was sitting. The French commissaries had just demanded the cession of Alost.

<sup>2</sup> On the Po, ceded to Louis at this very conjuncture in consequence of a treaty with the Duke of Mantua, and in defiance of the claims of the Empire, whereof it was a fief; the Emperor being, moreover, heir presumptive to the Duke (Ralph, i. 620). It was handed over on September 20 (Œuvres de Louis XIV., iv. 216-260).

<sup>3</sup> To which Louis having audaciously laid claim, his troops, in full peace, had summoned it to surrender; it submitted September 18-20 (Œuvres de Louis XIV., iv. 191-215).

<sup>4</sup> Foubert (see p. 116) had, as a Protestant, thought fit to leave France, and had settled in London (in Sherwood Street, whence he probably removed to Foubert's Place, Regent Street) about a year previously. He there taught riding, fencing, dancing, the management of arms, and mathematics (Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. xiv., part 2, July 6, 1680). (See also Evelyn, September 17, 1681.)

<sup>5</sup> William matriculated at Christ Church on December 5, 1681, aged 16 (Alumni Oxonienses), and took his B.A. degree from Corpus on November 24, 1685, and his M.A. on March 13, 1688 (Chester).

<sup>6</sup> Clarendon Correspondence (Singer), i. 63. Singer read this 'Card.'

Courtray, it might perhaps have more effect than any other means that could be used, besides that his doing it in a right manner, would be of good relish both here and abroad. I have not seen either of our East India men since you went, but I am told by one who had it from them, that they intend, upon Wednesday next, to have it moved that the Company shall give a yearly present to the King of 10000*l.* and leave it to his pleasure whether he will accept it or no; seeming to be very positive in their resolutions not to exceed it.<sup>1</sup> It will be well you should know the King's mind fully in it before you return, and to take care beforehand to engage him, that whatever is given may be fixed to a public use without being diverted. Mr. Secretary will write to you, so that if there is anything worth knowing, you will have it from him. Your lordship will be so kind as to make my excuse to the King, which is all I have to add, but that I am for ever yours,

HALIFAX.

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.<sup>2</sup>*

I have not yet been at Newmarket, but I sent your Highnesses letter thither, the same day I received it, and, by the account I have from thence, I find Sir Gabriel Sylvius will be immediately recalled; for as it was upon your Highnesses opinion principally that he was sent over, since you conceived it a respect due to the Princes where he had been employed, to go take his leave of them, so now that, upon second thoughts and by the occasion of their absence from home, you apprehend it to be more advisable he should not proceed in his journey, his Ma. is easily persuaded to comply with you in it, and therefore I suppose letters of revocation are sent by this post to him and, if your Highnesse hath any commands for mee, his coming over so soon will be a good opportunity of sending them. I need say nothing of the memorall lately delivered in France, the States embassadour being now with you, from whom you will receive a full account of it; (at)<sup>3</sup> the mean time the besieging Strasboursgh and the purchase of Casal at the same time giveth such an alarm as must awaken those that are the most a sleep, and for what concerneth us neerer, as a more immediate danger to this part of the world [. The Spanish embassadour informeth us that the proceedings of the French commissaryes at Courtray are of such a nature that there must be something done very suddenly, or else the conferences will have no kind of effect for the preservation of what remaines to the King of Spayne in the Low-Countries. Your Highnesse knoweth my thoughts perfectly upon this matter, and I have

<sup>1</sup> See Macaulay's *History*, edit. 1858, vol. i. p. 276.

<sup>2</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, second series, v. 524, September 27, 1681.

<sup>3</sup> Word supplied by the original editor; it should be 'in.'

1681 had them so long that I shall not easily bee brought to vary from them, no more than from my resolutions of being ever  
your Highnesses most obedient servant,

London, Sept. 27 1681.

HALIFAX.

The apprehensions to which Lord Halifax gives<sup>1</sup> expression were soon and abundantly justified: a day or two later<sup>2</sup> England, as well as the rest of Europe, was startled by the news that Strasburg, the key of Germany, had surrendered in time of peace to the menaces of French troops. The States, in consternation, despatched Van Beuning, as Ambassador Extraordinary,<sup>3</sup> to urge that Charles should at once join in the long-projected 'League of Guarantee,' directed towards the vindication of the Nimeguen treaty: and the Prince of Orange appears to have corresponded with Lord Halifax on the subject in language of extreme urgency. The Englishman replied as follows:—

•  
*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>3</sup>

Your Highnesses first letter found mee here and, upon the receipt of it, I made hast to Newmarket, to shew it to the King, who, upon consideration of what your Highnesse had written, gave mee order to send this answer from him that hee continueth in the same dispositions hee was in, when your Highnesse was here, in relation to the affayres abroad: that, in the condition hee is in, hee hath no reason to bee forward to provoke or draw upon himselfe the necessity of a warre; quite contrary, it is his interest to avoid it, as farre as it may bee done by fayre and honourable means: yet, in case of any such further progresse of the King of France as shall appear to bee a plaine violation of the peace in relation to the Spanish Netherlands, for the preservation of which his Majesty and the States are most immediately concerned,<sup>4</sup> hee will bee ready to joyne with the States in taking such measures as shall bee judged most proper upon such an occasion, and will call a Parliament, and do all other things that may inable him the more effectually to help his Allyes. I would not deferre the giving your Highnesse this account, though I presume you may depend more upon that which you expect from Mr van Beuninghen, after hee

<sup>1</sup> September 30 (Dutch Despatches).  
October 10

<sup>2</sup> He started October 3<sup>1</sup> (D'Avaux, *Négociations*) and arrived October 10<sup>12</sup> (Dutch Despatches); as an Ambassador Extraordinary he was compelled to the less formality. Hyde and Halifax paid him the compliment of the 'first visit,' and by all he was cordially received.

<sup>3</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 526, October 11, London.

<sup>4</sup> *Strasburg*, of course, concerned, *directly*, the *Empire*.

<sup>5</sup> He had come over, as already explained, about a week earlier, as Ambassador Extraordinary, to urge a coalition against France (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 230, 231).

hath spoken with the King, who cometh to-morrow hither 1681  
 from Newmarket. In the mean time hee hath represented the  
 condition of Christendome to us to bee, as it is too apparent,  
 melancholy enough, and yet your Highnesse seemeth to bee  
 yet more despayring, which I am very sorry for, yet cannot  
 but hope that God Almighty intendeth better things for you  
 than are in your present prospect. Your Highnesse knoweth  
 my thoughts upon this whole matter, and therefore cannot  
 doubt of my endeavouring, as farre as lyeth in mee, to promote  
 any thing that may tend to our common security, and, wherever  
 I shall bee so happy as to agree in opinion with your Highnesse  
 concerning it, no man shall outdo mee in my zele nor in any  
 thing else that may shew how ambitious I am to serve you.

London, oct. 11 1681.<sup>1</sup>

The efforts of the Prince of Orange were well seconded. On October  $\frac{16}{26}$ , five days after the date of this letter, the Dutch representatives handed in at the Court of St. James a formal memorial requesting the King of England to join the League of Guarantee, and so to arrange his internal affairs (a convenient euphemism for the summons of a Parliament) as that the vast resources of his flourishing realm might lie at his disposal.<sup>2</sup> This memorial was, as usual, referred to a Commission comprising the inner Committee of the Privy Council (Lord Halifax, Lord Hyde, the secretaries, &c.) with instructions to confer with the Dutchmen and report to the Council. The Ambassadors wrote home that both King and Ministers were much aggrieved by the pretensions of France; that they expressed every intention of fulfilling their obligations, and, in case of war, of summoning a Parliament;<sup>3</sup> but that there was an absence of alacrity in their movements which did not promise well. The Dutchmen on their part, as we find, urged as an absolute necessity that the representatives of both Powers should act with the utmost candour, as if either side derived instructions from a common source, since it was obvious that the two nations perforce ran fortunes together. They dilated on the magnificent position which the English King might

<sup>1</sup> No signature.

<sup>2</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, October  $\frac{19}{29}$ ,  $\frac{21}{31}$ , October  $\frac{22}{29}$ , November 1, and October  $\frac{25}{29}$ , November 1, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. 888, ff. 426 9; and Luttrell, October 21, i. 139.

<sup>3</sup> On October 13. Halifax told Reresby that although Parliament seemed for the moment indefinitely postponed, yet if Louis should make any fresh attempt upon *Flanders*, a session must ensue; and that an emergency of that kind might reconcile all things. But in default of such a conjuncture, 'there was now no hopes of a Parliament' (Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 220).

1681 occupy as head of a great peace confederacy; and they hinted, not obscurely, that immediate action would obviate certain suspicions current both at home and abroad.

Lord Radnor, as President of the Council, and consequently senior member of the Commission, betrayed the unwillingness of Charles to engage in measures so general as a guarantee of the peace of Nimeguen. Such a step, he insinuated, belonged to the German Princes; and he maintained that a special understanding between England, Holland, and Sweden for the protection of the *Spanish Netherlands alone* must secure all the interests with which England was directly concerned, especially as such an engagement was reinforced by his Majesty's promise of calling a Parliament in case of extremity. To this the foreign Ministers responded that the proposed League of Guarantee was designed to avert a European conflict, by which the safety of the Netherlands, as of other territories, must be assuredly compromised: they hinted that the mere promise of calling a Parliament in case of necessity seemed of little use, since the best energies of such an assembly could produce no immediate result; and they suggested, as a more appropriate expedient, arrangements for an immediate session, which, according to the general hope, might, if the House should prove tractable, place the King in a position to act with decision whenever circumstances should require it. Long were the discussions in Council, under the strictest conditions of secrecy, which these representations evoked,<sup>1</sup> and the Dutchmen flattered themselves, on good authority, that they had secured a majority of suffrages. Meanwhile Lord Halifax was writing to the Prince of Orange in a decidedly hopeful fashion: --

<sup>1</sup> *The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.* London, Oct. 21, '81. I had this morning two 'not extant,' of yours brought to me by St John Chardin. One of them of so long a date, viz. March 28<sup>th</sup>, that I think it will not be necessary to make any answer to it; and consequently all that you mention concerning your Spanish Embassy is no more in your thoughts, since you did not say a word of it when you were here, nor have not written of it since you left England. You seem to be satisfied with a settlement in the Admiralty, which I think will be taken care of; and it will suit very well with your desires to have a place of ease and quiet after having spent so much of your time abroad. I think such men as St John Chardin should be encouraged; and I shall be ready to do my part. I shall enquire about the possibility of a Protestant bank in the city; and when I have informed myself you shall have my opinion of it. Monsieur Van Beuningen is here; and there has been conferences with him, which have not yet brought anything to determination. We hear you have disposed Mademoiselle de Gouvernette to my L<sup>d</sup> of Dorset. [A false report.] 'Adieu' (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 233).

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.<sup>1</sup>*

I had not so long deferred my thanks to your Highnesse for 1681  
 your first letter, but that I was desirous to see the progresse of  
 Mr Van Beuninghens negotiation, that I might bee the better  
 able to offer my thoughts and conjectures to your Highnesse  
 upon the whole matter. In the mean time I am sorry to find  
 you are under greater discouragements, in relation to what is  
 expected from England, than I hope there is ground for. Your  
 Highnesse hath so much experience in things of this kind, and  
 are so well acquainted with the necessary delayes that belong  
 to them, that I am sure you will not make any hasty inferences,  
 because a proposition is not immediately accepted. There have  
 been conferences which are reported to the Councell, and I  
 hope the resolution that is taken upon it, will bee such as may  
 in some measure give your Highnesse satisfaction. If in every  
 circumstance the King doth not come up to that which is re-  
 quired of him, I hope the best interpretation will bee put upon  
 it, and, if there shall bee such foundation layed as here after,  
 more may bee built upon it, his Ma. will bee the best encouraged  
 to it, by seeing that the steps hee is now willing to make are  
 well received. Your Highnesse is so discerning as to know all  
 my meaning by this little hint and it is unnecessary for mee to  
 tell you that nothing would contribute more to the losse of  
 every thing abroad, than the seeming to despayre of England,  
 which in that respect can never bee justified, whilst there  
 remaineth any reasonable ground of hoping better things of us.  
 I will not say any thing of myselfe in this matter, but leave it to  
 your Highnesses favourable thoughts to judge of mee and of the  
 part I may have in it, which I am sure doth neither disagree  
 with what I have said in relation to the publique affayres, nor  
 with the professions I have made of being ever your Highnesses  
 most humbly devoted servant.

London, Nov. 4 1681.<sup>2</sup>

The remonstrance of the Dutch Ambassadors had hitherto remained unanswered, really that the dilemma might be secretly discussed between the Courts of Versailles and of St. James. Eventually a reply was drafted, and privately submitted by Charles and his confederate (Lord Hyde) to M. Barillon,<sup>3</sup> wherein after formal expressions of anxiety for the peace of Europe, and promises that the English King will do his utmost to secure the same, his Majesty reiterates the opinion that the Treaty of Guarantee should rather emanate from the German Princes, whom

<sup>1</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 528, November 1<sup>st</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> No signature.

<sup>3</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, part i., book i., appendix, pp. 79, 80 (despatches of Barillon).



1681 it more nearly concerns; but he engages that as soon as the Emperor, the King of Denmark, and the most important princes of the Empire shall have entered into the League, he will follow their example. 'And in order to give the strongest and most indubitable mark of the reality of his professions,' he further announces, with specific formality, that '*if any claim shall be pressed "par voye de fait" in the Spanish Netherlands, or if any considerable district or town within the said territory shall be annexed after what fashion soever, his Majesty will under such circumstances determine upon calling a Parliament, in order to be the more capable of effecting whatever may be held necessary for the succour of his confederates.*'<sup>1</sup> M. Barillon attempted to modify the stringency of these assurances, and specially insisted that the words 'Emperor and Empire' should be substituted for the more general expressions contained in the draft; but both Charles and Lord Hyde disavowed, in express terms, any intention of fulfilling the promise thus solemnly passed; and M. Barillon was specifically reminded that, since the declaration was intended to deceive, it was necessary to employ expressions which, while affording every loophole for evasion, were yet ostensibly cordial.<sup>2</sup>

On November 8 the reply was accordingly delivered, in due form, to the Dutch Ambassadors; and Lord Halifax, ignoring of course the circumstances which had preceded the presentation, hastened, in the innocence of his heart, to congratulate the Stadtholder upon the issue:—

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>3</sup>

It will not, I presume, bee unwelcome to your Highnesse, who hath seemed of late to have so little hopes of us, to know that the Memoriall given this day to the embassadours hath given them so much satisfaction that they have thought fit to give his Ma. thanks for it, and therefore it cannot bee doubted but your Highnesse will give it your approbation and, if so, I hope the melancholy thoughts you have of late been possessed with, will bee dispelled and give way to a cheerefuller and more encouraging prospect of the condition of the world. I was willing to prepare your Highnesse for the worst, in what I have said to you, since monsieur van Beuninghens coming over, that you might rather bee disappointed on the better

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Open)*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF. f. 126 (transcript of the answer).

<sup>2</sup> Dalrymple, as above.

<sup>3</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 530, November 8.

side than raise your expectations, whilst there was a possibility 1681 they might not be answered. I would beg of your Highnesse that you would immediately write to the King to approve what is done, as being one of the best means to encourage him to continue in the good dispositions hee hath at present. What your Highnesse sayeth concerning S<sup>r</sup> Gabriel Sylvius, maketh all apologies unnecessary for him to make. I am not a little pleased with the assurances hee bringeth mee of the continuance of your favour, which I will do my utmost endeavour to deserve, being, as I am, so intirely devoted to you.

London, Nov. 8 1681.<sup>1</sup>

The satisfaction evinced by Lord Halifax is no doubt perfectly natural. The definite engagement which had been thus wrested from the English King constituted an ostensible triumph<sup>2</sup> for the advocates of a spirited and anti-Gallican foreign policy, of whom Halifax was undoubtedly the chief.<sup>3</sup> The completeness of his delusion might seem a reflection on his sagacity but that others<sup>4</sup> were equally duped. The Prince of Orange,<sup>5</sup> Van Beuning,<sup>6</sup> Lord Keeper North,<sup>6</sup> none of these appear to have suspected the existence of a Secret Treaty.

Confident for once in the sincerity of his master, Lord Halifax seriously contemplated the probability of a European conflict; for, since French troops at this very juncture threatened Luxembourg, the master-fortress of the Netherlands, it appeared as if the English King might be summoned at any moment to substantiate his engagements with the Powers. In view of this contingency Lord Halifax was prepared with a broad and statesman-like policy which had been maturing throughout the

<sup>1</sup> Unsigned.

<sup>2</sup> See *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 71, for the remonstrances of the Duke of York.

<sup>3</sup> Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, p. 83 (Hyde is apprehensive of the influence of Halifax, among others); Koresby, *Memoirs*, p. 220, October 13; *ibid.* p. 224 (Lord Halifax 'no ways inclinable' to the French interest). By the expression 'French interest' Lord Halifax, of course, designates the Duchess of Portsmouth and her dependants.

<sup>4</sup> D'Avaux, *Négociations*, edit. Mallet, i. 165.

<sup>5</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, October 13, 1682; December 26, 1682; January 5, 1683, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, pp. 237, 341. While believing that Charles, by reason of domestic political difficulties and natural bent, is inclined to show as much consideration (*menager*) for the French Court as may consist with the interests of his kingdom, and that he has been for years even excessively afraid of war, Van Beuning does not consider that the two Crowns act in collusion, or that the English King and his Ministers are subsidised by France. He is confirmed in this belief by knowledge of the secret pecuniary tie which had existed between France and some of the English malcontents (*ibid.*).

<sup>6</sup> *Examen*, p. 474.

1681 autumn. The trial of Lord Shaftesbury impended in the near future, and there was strong reason to forbode that a Grand Jury packed by Whig Sheriffs<sup>1</sup> would ignore the Bill against him. Shaftesbury, on the other hand, was perfectly aware that a 'true bill,' once found, must place him at the mercy<sup>2</sup> of the Crown, and he offered, if released without trial, to retire into a voluntary exile.<sup>3</sup> Lord Halifax strongly advised that these proposals should be accepted. 'People' (so he told Reresby,<sup>4</sup> who had repeated some rumours on the subject) 'were too ready to pass their judgement; but if it were so, what could the King do better? He<sup>5</sup> had as good be set at liberty upon terms as by a jury, which would be sure to acquit him should he be brought to trial, though never so guilty. Nor could he do the King that harm if he were out, as such an act of mercy and legality<sup>6</sup> would do him good.'

This important concession, however, formed but a subordinate part of the scheme conceived by Lord Halifax. He foreshadowed comprehensive overtures directed towards a general conciliation, and hinted at an offer of amnesty for political prisoners of every shade. 'I have been informed' (wrote M. Barillon<sup>7</sup>) '[that] Lord Halifax has this project in his head, and that he talks on every occasion, like a man who has no other design than to reconcile the King of England with his people.' Even the concurrence of the Duke of York in the immediate summons of a Parliament might be purchased, so Lord Halifax imagined, by permission to attend its deliberations. 'Hitherto' (so he wrote to the Duke) 'it had been an un[speakable] trouble to him, that he could not get the better

<sup>1</sup> The shrieval election in London and Middlesex, to which at the time great importance attached, had gone against the Government.

<sup>2</sup> The constitution of the Lord Steward's Court, the tribunal reserved for Peers indicted during intervals of Parliament, was occasional, and at the arbitrary discretion of the Sovereign. The Earl's brother-in-law, Sir William Coventry, had realised the position within two days of the statesman's arrest (letter to Sir Thomas Thynne, July 1, 1681, *Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>3</sup> So Halifax told Reresby, *Memoirs*, October 13, pp. 219, 220. (See also *Halton Correspondence*, ii. 8. The King declared that he could not rely upon the word of Lord Shaftesbury.)

<sup>4</sup> November 6, p. 223.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Shaftesbury.

<sup>6</sup> If Reresby reports correctly, this must mean that Halifax himself believed in the innocence of Lord Shaftesbury.

<sup>7</sup> Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, p. 88 (Barillon's despatch of September 22). He alludes to a 'reunion of all the cabals, and a general amnesty, by which the catholic Lords and Danby and Shaftesbury may get out of prison, and the King of England offer on his part to forget all, provided the parliament on theirs will change their conduct with regard to him. I only suspect this: But I have been informed' (as above). France, of course, could imagine nothing less to her interest.

of his own thoughts when they stood in opposition to his Highness's commands, but that now he was so happy as to think nothing more reasonable, than what he so much desired, and that he should be present when the Parliament met, to answer for himself in case they had the confidence to lay anything to his charge.<sup>1</sup> 1681

Absurd as it may seem to speculate on the effects of a policy which never was tried, we cannot refrain from observing that, at the period in question, suggestions of this nature afforded some reasonable prospect of a settlement. Leniency<sup>2</sup> would certainly have secured for the Government the neutrality at least of Shaftesbury. In the country generally the tide, as we are already aware, had turned; the elections would probably have resulted to a great extent in returns favourable to the Government; and the very real anxiety for a strong and a patriotic foreign policy which at this crisis became certainly apparent would have strengthened the position of the Administration to an indefinite extent. Several of the Exclusion leaders were prepared to make terms,<sup>3</sup> and even to give large sums<sup>4</sup> for readmission to Court; and although Russell would probably have continued to head an uncompromising minority, it appears likely both that a satisfactory *via media* might

<sup>1</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 717. The date of this letter is approximately fixed by one from James to Legge, November 22 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 72), which evidently refers to it.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax carried into practice in private life the leniency he recommended in public. On January 4, 1682, Reresby was enabled, through a gentleman who had formerly belonged to the Exclusionists, to warn Lord Halifax that several of the men in power had underhand encouraged the addresses against him in the Westminster Parliament, 'which my lord took as a service done him, since at the least he knew thereby how to avoid and beware of them for the future. The same time' (adds Reresby) 'I brought a gentleman to my lord to ask him pardon for some things that he had been reported to have said of his lordship; and the truth is, *not only from policy (which teaches that we ought to let no man be our enemy whom we can help it), but from his disposition, I never saw any man more ready to forgive than himself, and I remember his expression to him was this: "Sir, if you have not said the words, I am very glad of it; if you have, I am so too that you need cause to be of another mind"*' (*Memoirs*, pp. 230, 231).

<sup>3</sup> See a remarkable passage in Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 643, 644 (evidently misdated by two years): 'The faction . . . began to fear what would become of themselves, and saw no legal method of safety, but in the choice of a parliament before the ferment of the nation, raised by the terrors of the popish plot, was sunk, and their interest in the boroughs of the country ruined. *Their leaders made very large propositions to the ministry of granting what money the King should desire, without either meddling with the Duke of York or any of the ministers in case the King should think fit . . . to call a parliament, and pass a general act of indemnity.*'

<sup>4</sup> See *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* x., part 4, p. 172 (newsletter of September 29; the writer gives Lord Halifax as his authority). See also *Letters* of second Earl of Chesterfield, November 1, pp. 207, 208.

1681 have been discovered in the matter of the succession and that Supplies would have been voted, which would have enabled Charles to take a dignified and independent part in the Continental controversy.<sup>1</sup> Nor can we avoid the conclusion that a concurrence in such anti-Gallican policy would have given an enormous impetus to the growing popularity of the Duke of York. Lord Halifax himself told Reresby, on October 13<sup>2</sup> (alluding, of course, to the influence of the Duchess of Portsmouth and her dependants), that 'if it were not for the King of France's interest here, he did not question but to put England into a very happy state and condition in a short time.'

But the influence of France extended much farther than Lord Halifax suspected, and Charles, as we know, was hampered by secret ties which precluded a national policy. His position indeed, with that of his confidant (Lord Hyde), was at this moment one of singular embarrassment, for the King of France now intimated to them with uncompromising plainness his intention of obtaining Luxembourg, in the last resort, at all hazards.<sup>3</sup> On the one hand, they regarded with positive terror the stoppage of French supplies which must follow on a breach with France, and dreaded the appeal to Parliamentary generosity which this would of necessity entail. On the other hand, they were acutely conscious of the extreme disgust which supine acquiescence in a spoliation of the Spanish monarchy must arouse in the country at large: and they were, as we have seen, exposed to the strongest instances on the part of the Allies, and of the anti-Gallican party at Court as represented by Lord Halifax, whose support they dared not forego.<sup>4</sup> Louis XIV. however, employed as usual the seductive argument of the purse; and as the results of these instances the sagacious attitude recommended by Lord Halifax was absolutely abandoned. On November 24 Lord Shaftesbury, indicted contrary to the

<sup>1</sup> Overtures to this effect had certainly been made, soon after the visit of the Prince of Orange, by those whom he had consulted (Macpherson, p. 128; *Life of James II.*, i. 693; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv., part 10, p. 33 [letter from James, October 3; the evidence is valuable, coming from a hostile source]).

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, edit. 1875, p. 220.

<sup>3</sup> See the remarkable despatch in Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, part i., book i., appendix, pp. 81-85.

<sup>4</sup> About this time Halifax tried to reconcile Burnet to the Government, and took him to Court. Charles told the divine he asked his service no longer than he should remain true to the Church and to the law. 'Lord Halifax upon that added, that the king knew he served him on the same terms, and was to make his stops' (*History*, edit. 1833, ii. 295).

advice of his former rival,<sup>1</sup> was acquitted by the Grand Jury.<sup>2</sup> Three days earlier, <sup>November 21</sup> <sup>December 1,</sup> Charles and his confidant, for a million livres, had privately undertaken that the pretensions of Louis upon Luxembourg should meet with no hindrance on the part of England.<sup>3</sup> 1631

The existence of this disgraceful arrangement was, of course, unknown to any save the high contracting parties, and the remaining Ministers of Charles II. continued in deluded ignorance their impotent consultations with the representatives of the States and of Spain.<sup>4</sup>

On <sup>November 28</sup> <sup>December 8</sup> a conference took place between the Dutch and Spanish Ministers, at the house of the latter. Halifax and the Secretaries were present.<sup>5</sup> By this time, of course, the news from Flanders had taken a

<sup>1</sup> A week earlier had appeared the famous satire *Absalom and Achitophel*, designed to excite public feeling against the accused statesman. Though anonymous, the authorship was an open secret, and the characters were immediately identified (See William Coventry to Thomas Thynne, November 21, *Longleat MSS.*). Halifax appears (line 882) as

‘Jotham of piercing wit and pregnant thought,  
Endued by nature and by learning taught  
To move assemblies, who but only tried  
The worse a while, then chose the better side,  
Nor chose alone, but turned the balance too,  
So much the weight of one brave man can do.

Curiously enough, Halifax records, on the authority of Dryden himself, that the poet was at one time offered money to write verses against him (Devonshire House ‘note book’).

He was released on bail November 28, and Reresby tells us that a great many, remembering the relationship between them, suspected Halifax of rejoicing at his release. Reresby himself was alarmed when, arriving rather early, he found a servant of Lord Shaftesbury with his nephew. ‘However, my Lord Halifax denied’ (being in league with Shaftesbury); ‘to me very seriously, and said he would speedily convince the world of the contrary by his demeanour in this particular’ (p. 221). (This, perhaps, points to the dismissal of the Duke of Monmouth from the Mastership of the Horse, which occurred a week later.) ‘Our friend,’ writes William Coventry to Thomas Thynne, December 1, ‘continues to stand in a worse light than I hope he deserves; many enemies and few friends are the portion of honest men in great stations’ (*Longleat MSS.*). Even Henry Savile was suspected by the rabid Tories. ‘What you say to me of Harry Savile,’ writes the Duke of York to his confidant, Legge, ‘agrees with what I heard of him from Paris a post or two ago, for there he talked of reconciling his Brother and Lord Shaftesbury, and of the necessity of a Parliament’s being speedily called at London, and since he Lord Halifax driv[es] on a Parliament tis no wonder he is against my having leave to go up, but I hope he will be disappointed in both’ (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 69).

<sup>4</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, part i., book i., appendix, p. 85.

<sup>5</sup> The Dutchmen were equally deceived. A week later they described the King’s zeal for the guarantee as equal to that of the States (*Dutch Despatches* [Open], British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF. f. 136).

<sup>6</sup> *Dutch Despatches* (Secret), British Museum, Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. SSS, f. 454.

1681 yet gloomier turn. It seemed evident that a regular siege of Luxembourg, which had been during some months practically invested, immediately impended; the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands had orders from Madrid to prevent a catastrophe at all hazards; while actual hostilities had been exchanged, near Bruges, by troops in the French and Spanish services. This the Spaniards naturally chose to regard as an open breach between the Crowns, and Ronquillos ostentatiously requested the advice of the Allied Powers. The Dutchmen were reticent, but their allusions to 'plighted faith,' their insinuation that the action to be taken by the Powers was a question of immediate urgency, and this apart from the consideration of whether or no an actual rupture had taken place, could hardly be misinterpreted.

My Lord Halifax (they report) spoke entirely in the same sense as regards the necessity for an exact observance of the treaties, and of the faith which had been pledged.<sup>1</sup> He further alluded to the King's promise of calling a Parliament should the French pursue their claims in the Spanish Netherlands 'par voie de fait;' and added that although, under the circumstances, some questions might be raised, his own opinion was, that the King should perform (his engagements?);<sup>2</sup> that the Spaniards could in effect, regard the said blockade of Luxembourg as a breach of the peace; that his Majesty took the deepest interest in the preservation of Luxembourg; and that we were met to consider what was best to do or leave undone, in a matter of common importance, which must be regarded as of deep and almost equal concern to each of the three parties. But that it was advisable to learn from those who are most nearly concerned, and who have the best information,<sup>3</sup> what are the main points to be debated; that the present condition of this King's affairs is well known, and that, until the successful issue of a Parliament little can be effected from this quarter; and that we ought to take into consideration the financial circumstances (?) of the French King; and whether it were not advisable to await the result of a Parliament, and the augmentation of the League; and that since we were discussing the affair on a common footing, each must fearlessly advance what he considered worthy of attention.

Hyde affected to endorse these sentiments. Ronquillos with compliments demanded a promise of *specific* assist-

<sup>1</sup> 'Gegevene woordt.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Soude niet presteren.'

<sup>3</sup> 'Maer dat men zulen moest verstaen uit die het directelyck concernirt ende de beste kennisse hebben van alle hetgeen in dezen to consideren is.'

<sup>4</sup> 'That Charles and the States should be severally responsible for contingents of 8,000 men.'

was duly reported, dextrously demurred, on the plea that 1681 his hands were tied until he could answer for the pecuniary intentions of a Parliament. The Dutchmen in return pressed the immediate issue of Parliamentary writs, and a compromise was hereupon effected on the basis of a fresh remonstrance to the Court of Versailles, to be supported, if unsuccessful, by an immediate appeal to Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

Lord Halifax immediately warned his brother that the task of presenting a memorial would again devolve upon the Envoy:

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>2</sup>

London, Dec.  $\frac{1}{11}$ , '81.

In answer to your last, I think you have reason to turn your thoughts towards home, it being time to be weary of the station you are in, especially when there is such a prospect of things abroad as may reasonably discourage you from staying much longer in your present employment, and therefore I continue my endeavours to get you another here, and hope in a little time it may be brought about: but till it is, I desire you will not move for lodgings or anything else: for though I am come late to the trade of a courtier, yet I know so much of it, that it is not skillfull to press for too many things at once; and at a time where an extraordinary thing is to be done for you, and a rule broken that you may be admitted, to mention a thing that hath so unwelcome a sound at court as every thing must have where money is expected. I assure you there is no friendship in the Treasury in these cases, and your late noble friend of blessed memory<sup>3</sup> hath taken sufficient care there should be no room left for doing good turns, even to the smallest proportions. I have been so sensible of the necessity I should have lodgings in Whitehall, that I have the King's promise to have the first that are to be had; but in the meantime I content myself with a little garret, where I may write a letter and retire sometimes for half an hour, which I find to be very convenient whilst I am under the necessity of spending a good many hours of the day at Court. I think we shall shortly send you another memorial upon the business of Luxembourg, which is so extraordinary that it groweth to be above our digestion, though we have of late been pretty well used to swallow. Yours &c.

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>4</sup>

I should have hoped that his Ma. answer to the States Embassadors would have given your Highnesse satisfaction in all the parts of it, since it hath in a good measure silenced the

No

December 10

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter excii., p. 246.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Danby.

<sup>4</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 531, December 2.



1681 objections of those here who seldome fayle to strike at the weak part of any thing that is done by the Government. I do not find the Embassadours think it necessary to presse any explanation concerning Luxembourg, it being so plainly comprehended in the words of the answer, that the mooying any thing further in it would look like an unreasonable distrust, which would be of very ill consequence, whilst the King is in a disposition that your Highnesse hath reason to approve, and therefore hee ought to be encouraged and cherished in it, and not thrown back, by offering any thing to him that looketh like a suspition, for which there is not sufficient ground. You will receive a full account from your Ministers here, of the resolutions taken in order to the affayres abroad, and I hope they are such as will incline your Highnesse not to despayre altogether so much of us, as you may have done for the time past. I cannot pretend that my opinion should have much weight, but I do truly believe that, if upon the representation intended to be made to the King of France, there shall not be some reasonable satisfaction given in the matter of Luxembourg, his Ma. will call a Parliament, without which hee is in no condition of making good the least of his engagements to his Allyes. Your Highnesse shall never be disappointed in the beleefe you have that I will contribute my endeavours, in my small capacity, to all the publique ends that may put us in such a condition at home as may inable us to help our friends abroad. In the mean time I must not omit to congratulate with your Highnesse, for the discovery of a thing that is not capable of any good interpretation,<sup>1</sup> and, whether you are particularly concerned in it or not, I am sure it concerneth you to have a great deal of caution, as well to gratify your friends, that would preserve you, as to disappoint your enemies that would destroy you. My warmest wishes for your prosperity shall ever attend you, being, as I am, so sincerely devoted to your service.

London, Dec. 2 1681.

The scheme of the proposed memorial was soon definitely settled. More than one conference took place between the Ministers and the Dutch and Spanish Embassies, while the draft finally adopted was, it appears, the work of Halifax himself; for this reason we give it in full:—

*Au Roy très Chrestien !<sup>2</sup>*

Les soussignés ministres du roy de la Grande Bretagne et des Estats Generaux des Provinces Unies ont reçue des ordres

<sup>1</sup> A plot at The Hague, supposed to involve the kidnapping of the Prince. The reader is also referred to a letter of Hyde, dated same day (Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 536), which, in view of the secret treaty he had concluded with France ten days earlier, is curiously disingenuous.

<sup>2</sup> *Memorie vanden Ambassadeur van Groot Brettagne aen den Koning*

expres pour représenter à votre Majesté que le roy d'Espagne en vertu des traittés faicts avec Sa diete Majesté de la Grande Bretagne et avec les dits Estats, Provinces, villes, places et droicts les a fait prier avecq les instances très vives par les memoires cy jointes de vouloir proceder à l'exécution de ce qu'ils contiennent enfondant ceste demande, sur des infractions à la paix de Niemègue. Votre Majesté peut juger par là de la nécessité indispensable dans laquelle ils se trouvent de céder aux dietes instances du roy Catholique en cas qu'ils seroient si malheureux que de ne pouvoir obtenir de Vostre Majesté un relachement des procédures, quy donnent un juste sujet de plainte à Sa diete Majesté Catholique. Il est certain sire, que le monde est infiniment allarmé des procedez de ceux quy prétendent d'agir par ces ordres contre les sujets de Sa Majesté Catholique, en divers lieux, et sur divers pretextes et particulièrement en la province de Luxemburg et contre La ville capitale, laquelle depuis quelques mois est serrée d'une manière que les places formellement bloqués ne le sont guerres plus rigoureusement nonobstant qu'on fait profession de observer la paix.

Cequy donne lieu d'apprehender plus vivement les suites d'une procédure si extraordinaire est, que de temps en temps à la sollicitation du roy Catholique nos dits maitres ont employé des offices et representations très pressantes, sur ce sujet sans qu'elles ayent produit, jusques à présent aucun fruit, ou obtenu aucun relachement dans les rigueurs, dont ceux quy commandent les troupes de Vostre Majesté dans la diete province de Luxembourg se sont servis, pour empêcher entièrement le commerce avecq la diete Ville.

Les soussignés peuvent assuerer Vostre Majesté en toute sincerité que le susdict roy de la Grande Bretagne et les susdits seigneurs Estats n'ont point d'autre but dans les offices qu'ils fait à l'instance du roy d'Espagne si non de conserver la paix establee par les derniers traittés et par une prevoiance necessaire d'affirmer le repos dans l'Europe, et d'empêcher qu'elle ne retombe dans les miseres de la guerre dont elle vient d'estre à peu près accablée.

Ils ne doutent point que votre Majesté ne soit touchée des mesmes considerations, et qu'elle voudra bien conserver la paix, pour le soulagement de ses peuples, aussy bien, que pour le repos de ses voisins.

Et puisque le dict Roy de la Grande Bretagne et lesdits Seigneurs Estats sont dans une entière disposition de cultiver l'amitié et la bonne correspondance avecq Vostre Majesté par tous les moyens possibles, ils ne scauroient s'empêcher d'espérer qu'elle escouterà les instances quy viennent de leur part et qu'outre les sentimens de justice, qui doivent donner le mouvement à toutes les actions des Princes, elle se laissera toucher

1681 par la vue des misères qui accompagnent la guerre et qu'elle se mostra devant les yeux le déplorable estat a laquelle la Chrestienté sera entraînée par une nouvelle rupture.

Vostre Majesté aura la gloire de prevenir ces maux dont la seule pensée frappe les coeurs les moins sujets a s'atténir, sans que cela luy comte aucun pas ou demarche extraordinaire.

On luy demande seulement que Vostre Majesté donne ordre à ses officiers de guerre de s'abstenir de toute voye de fait, et de ne faire aucunes demarches, quy peuvent estre raisonnablement réputées pour des contraventions de la paix et particulièrement pour ce qu'il est de la ville de Luxemburg, qu'il luy plaise de donner des commandements exprès quel'on y rende la commerce et l'entrée libre ou au moins qu'elle donne liberté entière aux sujets du roy d'Espagne d'y entrer et d'y faire transporter toutes sortes de denrées munitions et provisions, soit il qu'elles soient portées de leurs terres ou d'ailleurs.

Les dits ministres souhaitent de recevoir la responce de vostre Majesté sur ce sujet et espèrent qu'elle sera telle qu'elle osterà au roy très Catholique les sujets de plaintes, quy luy fait à cette heure reclamer l'assistance de ses Alliez et que le dict roy de la Grande Bretagne et lesdicts Seigneurs États auront le contentement de pouvoir conserver en leur entier deux choses quy leur sont si chères à seavoir<sup>1</sup> la jouissance de la paix et de l'amitie de Vostre Majesté.

Copies of the memorial were, at once despatched for the sanction of the States,<sup>2</sup> and in anticipation of their approval to Henry Savile; and Lord Halifax wrote simultaneously to his brother and to the Prince of Orange upon this topic :-

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>3</sup>*

London, Dec. 3<sup>th</sup>, '81.

Mr. Secretary Jenkins telleth me he writeth to you by this post and sendeth you the memorial which is intended to be deliver'd by the Dutch Embassadour and yourself in conjunction; I do not know what success it will have, but I am sure a great deal dependeth upon it, for it is certain if the K. of France will not be perswaded to leave the town of Luxembourg at liberty, we are engaged here to call a Parliament, and in case that by a miracle we should grow wise and agree, the French might perhaps repent the having forced us into our right senses. I believe you are not sorry that in such a case as this a memorial is sent ready drawn to you, since it secureth you from any blame that might else be thrown upon you by saying too much or too little; besides that you would hear the

<sup>1</sup> 'Comme' was eventually substituted for 'à seavoir.'

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 249 (Secretary Jenkins to Mr. Savile).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, letter cxcv., p. 249.

greatest part of the weight, by any thing that I hear of 1681  
 Embassadour Sturembergh.<sup>1</sup> I hear the gentleman that was  
 thought of to purchase your place in the Bedchamber hath  
 changed his mind, so that your friends must endeavour to find  
 out another chapman. I hope you will furnish y<sup>r</sup>self with a  
 good stock of papers concerning the finances and the marine  
 against you come over, they being things I shall be very glad  
 to have copies of, because they may be usefull to me upon  
 many occasions.<sup>2</sup> Adieu.

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.<sup>3</sup>*

I cannot lose the opportunity of presenting my humble  
 duty to your Highnesse by M<sup>r</sup> Skelton, who is ambitious to bee  
 restored to your better opinion, and assureth mee, as hee will  
 your Highnesse in a more effectual manner, that hee will upon  
 all occasions endeavour to deserve it.<sup>4</sup> It may conduce much  
 to the ends you ayme at, in uniting the Allyes against their  
 common danger, that your Highnesse will give him your  
 instructions now, and continue them from time to time, as you  
 judge them necessary, especially to the Princes of Lunenbourg,  
 who, as they are very considerable in themselves, so it happeneth  
 well that your Highnesse hath a great influence upon them.  
 I can adde nothing to what your Highnesse knoweth already  
 concerning the Memoriall, which is sent over to bee approved  
 by the States, as it is here by his Ma., and when I tell you that  
 M<sup>r</sup> van Beuninghen is not dissatisfyed with our present dis-  
 positions here, I will presume your Highnesse will not bee so  
 neither from the account hee giveth of us; for myselfe, nothing  
 shall ever make mee vary from my professions of service to  
 you.

The prospect of a favourable answer from the Court of  
 Versailles appeared extremely slight; an actual rupture  
 between England and France seemed therefore no remote  
 contingency. Charles himself was compelled to remonstrate  
 with M. Barillon in tones of significant urgency; and  
 the Frenchman, fearful lest circumstances should prove  
 too strong for the courage of his Britannic Majesty,  
 in vain represented at the Dutch Embassy that the  
*demolition* of the fortress of Luxembourg would be  
 accepted by the French King as a full equivalent for his

<sup>1</sup> Dutch Ambassador at Versailles, at the moment on leave.

<sup>2</sup> He probably means in order to induce jealousy of France.

<sup>3</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 554. This letter bears  
 no date, but was probably sent about December 5. (See *Savile Correspondence*, p. 249.)

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Skelton was a 'persona' very much 'ingrata' to the Prince of  
 Orange. He had been selected to replace Henry Sidney at The Hague, but  
 upon the Prince's remonstrances the appointment had been cancelled, and it  
 is evident that Mr. Skelton was now upon a diplomatic mission to Germany.

1681 territorial demands in the Netherlands. To all such appeals the Dutchmen responded 'that as regards a point so peculiarly her own the allies of Spain could only acquiesce in her decision. 'In this sense,' the Ambassadors reported, 'Lord Halifax has written to his brother, Mr. Savile (at the latter's request), in order that he might know how the suggestion as to the razing of Luxembourg, which had been made to him at Paris, was regarded by his Court : ' —

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>2</sup>

London, Dec. 15, '81.

I had yours yesterday, in which you mention the receipt of the memorial sent from hence, that will I suppose be delivered immediately upon the arrivall of the Dutch Embassadour. It will be well if it should move your great monarch to act a little less like a conquerour than he doth now in time of peace, and to offer some expedient which may be better approv'd by the Spaniards than the razing Luxembourg. I cannot think it will depend upon any thing that is done concerning that particular place so much as about the King of France his present inclinations in generall, whether the world is to have war or peace. We are not in a posture to wish the first, but if a Parliament is call'd in such an exigency, I do not know but men might grow wiser, and agree to act more vigourously than would otherwise be expected from them. I will do my best to enquire out a chapman for your place, though the Court at present lyeth under such a scandal of non-payment that men's dealing with it is much discouraged. You may be sure my own interest shall no more be an argument to me in this than in any thing else where you are concerned. I must now chide you a little for your spleen, which I think hath made you mistake very much in some things you mention in your letter. . . .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, December 19 and 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter exvii., p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> 'Do not you remember you desired me to move the King you might return in the Spring, especially if your place in the Admiralty might be fixed before your coming? Both those things are granted you, and I expect in a little time that a new commission will be prepared, where you and Sir John Chicheley shall be added, and upon settling this matter so at your own desire, the King hath pitch'd upon a man to succeed you, and you call this an underhand dealing, and a wrong to you, and look upon it as a supplanting you; I will go further, and say though the King was not so engaged, you ought never to deliberate about your coming over, but thank God for being recalled, especially if you have so good a place to receive you when you come home. I know so much of this, and am so sure I am in the right, that if you should yet have any wavering thoughts I must overrule them. You give a hint that if you had been Embassadour it would by this time have procured you a rich wife, and yet if you will recollect yourself, you cannot forget that when upon an intimation of one of your friends here and not upon your own, I sent to you to know the truth of it, your answer was that it was so remote and uncertain a prospect that you did not at all

We cannot doubt that Lord Halifax himself anticipated 1681 an outbreak of hostilities, and in this conviction it was with satisfaction rather than with regret that he informed Mr. Savile of his impending recall. No reason is assigned, but we may conclude that Savile had not proved sufficiently pliant to the 'French interest':—

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*

London [Jan. 25] '81.

I have not been unmindfull of you, though it is some time since you heard from me. This day order is given for a new commission of the Admiralty,<sup>2</sup> in which you and S<sup>r</sup> John Chicheley are to be added, and I am enquiring what can be alledged for your precedence in your capacity of Vice-Chamberlain, that you may suffer no diminution, if anything of that kind belongeth to you of right; . . . I was not sorry to receive the King's commands this day to tell you he would have you return home within a month or six weeks to give place to your successor, my Ld. Preston, who goeth under the same character you have, and is not likely to obtain a greater whilst he stayeth abroad, so that you will not have the mortification of seeing that allow'd to another which you could not obtain. I don't know how far your passion for a fair lady may make your return at this time uneasy to you, but I am such a clown as to think there are two reasons to make a man at least content to leave a mistress, for anger if she is not kind, and to cure a surfeit if she is, but this is such unmanly doctrine that I will not provoke you with any more of it.<sup>3</sup> . . . George Legge is to be Master of the Ordinance, S<sup>r</sup> Christopher Musgrave the Lieutenant, and my L<sup>d</sup> Noel Governour of Portsmouth.

build upon it; this being the case, it seemeth to me you have as little reason to complain of what is part as you have to entertain such despairing thoughts of your condition, w<sup>h</sup> I hope deserveth better words from you, or at least will do when you are return'd and settled in your employment. I wish it for your sake as well as my own that it may be soon, and then you shall have the second part of a kind chiding. Adieu.

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter xciii., p. 247. In the book it is given as December 12, which is obviously wrong. We give the probable date in brackets.

<sup>2</sup> See following letter.

<sup>3</sup> If not, there is no great cause of lamenting for you. This new employment will not take away the advantage you have by the King's promise of parting with your place in the bedchamber, and I employ all your friends to hunt for a chapman, which if once got upon any reasonable terms I should think you better established than if you were Extraordinary Embassadour for your life; for this reason.

<sup>4</sup> 'In great earnest, if you can prevail with yourself to trust me in this case without giving you at this time my particular reasons for it, I would by no means have you delay your coming over, but embrace the opportunity as one of the welcomest things, if I judge right, that could have come to you. If there is anything you can part with to more advantage to your successor than you can to anybody else, either house, furniture, &c., you may let me know, and I can propose it to him.'

- 1681 We expected to have heard before this the memorial had been deliver'd, but I suppose the Dutch Embassadour may have stay'd longer upon the way than he intended. In case such an answer shall be given to it (which is most probable) as will immediately produce the calling a parliament,<sup>1</sup> you are to consider whether you will send to your corporation of Newark,<sup>2</sup> not that I would perswade you to it, if you ask my opinion; only the advertisement may be seasonable, and you may do as you see cause.<sup>3</sup>

On January  $\frac{3}{17}$ , after a delay of more than a fortnight -- caused, as Lord Halifax suggests in the preceding letter, by the temporary absence of the Dutch representative from Versailles—Louis XIV. created a fresh obstruction by his insolent and peremptory refusal to consider a *joint* remonstrance. Savile hereupon declined an independent audience, and despatched an express for instructions.<sup>4</sup> His messenger arrived January  $\frac{7}{17}$ , and the foreign Ministers, reasonably enough, contended that the manœuvre of Louis should be regarded as a rejection of the entire overture. Other counsels, however, prevailed; and while the behaviour of Savile was commended, he received orders to waive the dispute and to present a separate memorial: <sup>5</sup>

*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*<sup>6</sup>

Jan.  $\frac{8}{18}$ , '81.

This cometh to you by the express you sent to us, and, though the objection made to a joint memorial is a little extraordinary, considering they had received one of the same kind lately

<sup>1</sup> On the 4th Halifax spoke to Beresby as if 'a parliament was not far off.'

<sup>2</sup> As early as December 11 people had been 'mighty busy in making their interest for Parliament men' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 9, p. 87).

<sup>3</sup> *The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*—London, January  $\frac{5}{17}$ , '81-2. I writ to you last post of your being put with St John Chicheley into the new Commission of Admiralty, and I did not forget to do all I could to preserve the rank due to your office of Vice-Chamberlain, but, upon searching precedents, we cannot find that there appeareth enough to justify your precedence. It fulleth out pretty well that my Lord Brounkar was placed in the commission, not according to his quality, but the time of his entrance, so that you must come after him, and at a venture we will get you placed before St John Chicheley, who I hope will not dispute it; if he should, I will not undertake you shall succeed in the contest. Lt. Spencer told me he would write to you about his nephew, so that I need say nothing of it, but leave it to you to judge how far it is advisable for you to stir in a thing of that kind, which nobody can do so well at this distance. I have not time to add any more but that I am yours' (*Savile Correspondence*, letter cxcix., p. 256).

<sup>4</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 254-256.

<sup>5</sup> *Dutch Despatches*; and compare *Savile Correspondence*, p. 257.

<sup>6</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter cci., p. 259.

without taking any exceptions; yet, since his Christian Majesty <sup>1681</sup><sub>82</sub> will not allow that method, he must be comply'd with in his own, and there is no more to be done but to follow the directions you will receive from Mr. Secretary, to put the plural number into the singular w<sup>ch</sup> was intended to have been presented jointly: this manner of proceeding doth not afford any great hopes of a good answer, but, let it be what it will, it will be good to have it as soon as may be, that we may be able to take our resolutions here accordingly.<sup>1</sup> . . .

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.<sup>2</sup>*

I have been silent beyond the bounds of good manners, from the expectation that an answer out of France would have given so much light as that I might have given your Highnesse a full account of the Kings resolutions here; but it seemeth they have found out a way to gaine a delay of 8 dayes more, by refusing to admitt a joynt Memorall, though, besides the authority of an instance of an elder date, the last which was delivred to monsieur de Croissy, in the very same manner, did not meet with the same exceptions to it.<sup>3</sup> The most reasonable conclusion that,

<sup>1</sup> 'My Lord Preston sayeth he will write to you by this conveyance, and desireth to know whether you have a secretary that you would think fit to recommend to him. I told you in a former letter that it might perhaps be convenient to you as well as to him to deal with him for your house and severall other things that nobody else will so well take off y<sup>r</sup> hands; therefore pray let me know, that I may acquaint him, and perswade him to send over somebody to treat with you upon those matters. Your friends here conclude it will be best for you to come over hither before he stirreth from hence, and, since your three years will be out by the end of February, I would by no means have you stay any longer. My L<sup>d</sup> Hyde, who writeth to you, is of the same opinion, and so is Harry Guy, and you must allow us to overrule you, in case you should be otherwise inclined. There are very many reasons for your hastening home, if all your friends do not mistake, but there is one very scurvvy one, which will perhaps surprise you, as it did me when I first found it. I moved the King concerning a man that offer'd himself to treat for your place in the Bedchamber, and, taking it for granted you had his promise, I did not expect any difficulties in gaining his consent, but I was much disappointed when he told me he had not given you his promise but with reserves, and that he never intended it when you had so good a place as this in the Admiralty, which he hath so lately bestow'd upon you. I was not wanting to press him as much as was fit, and left it there; but, lamenting my ill success to my L<sup>d</sup> Hyde, and asking his opinion, as much the more knowing courtier, what I should do further in it, he advised me to move no more, [?] for fear of drawing on a second refusal, but that I should let it rest till you come, and then he did not at all doubt but you would prevail better for yourself than any of your friends could do for you. H. Guy is of the same mind too, so that I am afraid to differ with men that understand the methods of the Court better than I can pretend to; if you think otherwise, I am ready to do in this as in all other things that concern you just as you would have me; I will only put you in mind once more that in this consideration as well as in many others it is advisable for you to make haste home. Adieu.' (For Savile's quaint recommendations of a secretary, see *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 351 b., May 15).

<sup>2</sup> January 12, 1681 (o.s.), misplaced by a year in Groen van Prinsterer, *Lectures*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. 469.

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 224.



1681  
1682 can bee drawn from such proceeding, is that the answer is not likely to give satisfaction in what the Memoriall required, and that, if there was any disposition in the French Court to comply, they would have done it without such a kind of hesitation, and not have lost the good grace of it, by affecting a delay, especially when attended by such discouraging circumstances.<sup>1</sup> Your Highnesse must therefore bee pleased to suspend your conjectures and supresse your jealousies, till the answer cometh, and when it appeareth<sup>2</sup> plainly that the intercession of the King and the States hath<sup>3</sup> no successe, recourse is to bee had to that which seemeth<sup>4</sup> to bee the onely remaining remedy, which is the calling a Parliament, though I must give your Highnesse this melancholy advertisement before hand, that, from the best observation I can make, I find much more cause to entertaine fears than to flatter myselfe with the hopes of any good effects from it.<sup>5</sup> But my conclusion is, that, since an agreement is possible, it is to bee attempted, though the consequences of an unkind separation at our next meeting are such as will bee

<sup>1</sup> *The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile.*—London, January 23, February 2, '81-2.

\* I had yours yesterday, and by what you write to Mr. Secretary I find we are to stay a little longer for an answer, which by what appeareth yet is not like to be very satisfactory when it cometh. Your letter to my Lord Preston is deliver'd, and I suppose he will write to you about those of your servants which you are willing to discharge, he seeming desirous to receive them into his service; in the mean time, I am glad you dispose yourself to come over suddenly, and if I can judge right for you, the sooner you do it the better; but a supply from hence being it seems such a necessary thing to you at this time, I have moved my L<sup>d</sup> Hyde in it, and he is willing to advance what will be due for your allowance when you come away, but is somewhat more difficult upon the payment of what your extraordinaries may amount to so long before-hand. H. Guy is of opinion that in time he may be brought to it, but thinketh he is to be prevail'd upon by degrees, and in that method I shall not be wanting to do my part for you. I think you look upon your matter of the Bedchamber with a more despairing eye than it requireth, for, besides that your friends make little doubt of your prevailing with the King when you come yourself, I do not find any body thinketh your place is sunk by this new one you have in the Admiralty, but that your title to it remaineth as it did: so that I see no reason for the agonies you seem to be in upon this subject. I agree with you in your resolutions concerning yourself in case of a Parliament, for believe me the best place in either house is where a man may have the entertainment of hearing without the obligation of speaking. R. Spencer telleth me he will write to you, so that you must expect the trouble of making your own answer, though I shall not neglect in the meantime to prepare him for it. Adieu.' (*Savile Correspondence*, letter cciv., p. 263. The letter cited is not extant.)

<sup>2</sup> 'Apparett' in Groen van Prinsterer.

<sup>3</sup> 'Hatt,' *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> 'Seemett' *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The trial of Shaftesbury had, of course, exasperated matters. On the previous day Halifax told Henry Sidney (*Diary* [Blencowe]) 'he was still for a parliament; that others were not. He did not think there would be an agreement. He finds fault with the Ambassador for pressing. Says the Prince must be more of a courtier. The Duke comes, if there should be a Parliament to answer for himself.' Sidney had just returned from a visit to Holland, undertaken in his private capacity. Halifax had told Sidney on his departure (as the latter records) 'that he wou'd write and give me caution of what I said to the Prince. He thinks he keeps correspondence with people here; is' (himself) 'much for a Parliament' (Blencowe, ii. 225, 227).

more immediately fatal to our Allies abroad, and give an advantage to France above any other thing in the world that can happen to them. Wee have men here that will sacrifice every thing to their anger, besides that it is as much the interest of ill men to hinder an agreement, as it is of good men to promote it. This I say onely to rescue your Highnesse from the trouble of a disappointment, if you should rely too much upon the issue of our next meeting. For my own part, my thoughts are the same as those you were pleased to approve, when I had the honour to entertaine you concerning them, which make mee presume your Highnesse will still have the same of mee, which I shall never forfeit, if either my respect for your person or my zeale for your interests can preserve them to mee.

London, Jan. 12, 81.

The interpretation drawn by Lord Halifax from the prevaricating policy of the French Foreign Office could not be gainsaid; and in consequence no doubt of repeated instances on the part of the statesman, even the English monarch, despite his clandestine engagements, found himself compelled to consider, at least in appearance, the possibility of an actual breach with France. He acted with his usual dexterity, and on January 21,<sup>1</sup> by royal command, the Committee of Council discussed the advisability of precipitating hostilities. His Majesty, so the Committee learned, had resolved on the immediate despatch of Lord Preston to his new post at Versailles, with instructions 'positively to demand restitution . . . of the late conquests in the Spanish Netherlands and Germany;' and he had at the same time determined that Mr. Chudleigh, Envoy-designate to The Hague, should at once present his credentials, in order that he might the sooner effect 'an agreement and peace' with the States.

The Committee was required to report the result of their deliberations on these points in the course of the afternoon. Secretary Jenkins and, as was natural, Lord Hyde deprecated tactics so daring, on the plea that

<sup>1</sup> The paper on which this passage is founded was discovered by Mr. Christie at St. Giles. He read the date as 'June 21.' This is a manifest error for Jan. In June 1681 there was no question of supplanting Savile by Preston. In June Skelton, not Chudleigh, was Envoy-designate to The Hague (Hyde to Orange, June 21, 1681; Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. 508). Chudleigh went to Holland about the end of January or beginning of February 1681 (Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. 542). The Morocco embassy arrived January 1, 1682 (Luttrell, i. 154), and the treaty was signed March 23 and June 6, 1682, the signature of Halifax being appended to the second treaty (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* viii. 26). The paper itself is printed in full by Christie (*Life of Shaftesbury*, vol. ii. appendix, p. cxviii). How it reached Lord Shaftesbury we are at a loss to understand.

16<sup>th</sup> money was wanting to support the charges of a war; while Lord Halifax, from whom no doubt the proposal originally emanated, defended the counsel with extreme urgency. 'His Majesty' (he said) 'may be sure to have money, when once bravely engaged against one whom the country so much abhorreth, and if he be not engaged therein before the Parliament sit, they will advance no money for any design whatsoever. Therefore, if his Royal Highness<sup>1</sup> have a public command in his design, he will then have it in his own breast to unite the people again; and if this be long deferred, I assure you it may prove dangerous both to the government and trade. The French King will in a little time, if he be let alone, grow so potent as not to need our help or value our hatred; and when once it is done, and the Ministers despatched, as well to Holland as France, to acquaint them<sup>2</sup> early with it, less they pretend jealousy— I say when that is done, we may safely have a Parliament, and just before that must secure<sup>3</sup> Shaftesbury. As for the Duke of Monmouth, he cannot hurt the progress of this affair, and I wish his Royal Highness prove but compliable in this, then we trample all those little pretenders in pieces.'

Lord Halifax was warmly seconded by Clarendon, Lord Hyde's brother; but at the afternoon meeting, where Charles himself was present, it was decided by a large majority to defer so drastic a measure until some formal understandings should have been effected with the Protestant Powers. The spirited policy recommended by Lord Halifax was thus evaded, and he was compelled to drift along, a passive and unconscious agent in the long-drawn game of procrastinating intrigue wherein the two monarchs were the principals. To them and their accomplice, Lord Hyde, time of course appeared every-

<sup>1</sup> His Royal Highness had written to Legge, January 5: 'So long as Lord Halifax continues in such credit, I can expect no good. . . . I hope the two foraine ministers you named, with the help of Lord Halifax will not whedle us into a war, if they do I know the monarchy will be in great danger, and they not the better for it' (*Ilist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 44, misdated 1670). See also, for similar criticisms, January 19 (p. 46), January 23 (p. 47).

<sup>2</sup> The States.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Christie supposes this to indicate the arrest of Shaftesbury. His bail expired February 13, and it is difficult to see what the Government could have gained by a fresh arrest, as he would have certainly demanded his *Habeas Corpus*. Can the expression 'secure' signify 'secure his services'? 'I hear,' York had written, January 12. 'that Lord Halifax, and other of the great men have privat conferences with Lord Shaftesbury or some other of that party as Essex and Montegu, and are making fair weather with them, pray enquier,' &c. (*Ilist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 44).

thing; and, the crisis once averted, it became easy to frame additional pretexts for delay. During some weeks, for instance, no formal reply was vouchsafed to the English memorial; but about the end of January M. Barillon presented a counter-memorial, which again and directly urged, as an adequate solution, the *demolition* of the fortress in dispute. The eagerness with which Charles II. advocated this expedient, and his slighting references to the efficacy of a Parliamentary appeal, excited in the highest degree the distrust of the confederates; and in the course of conferences held between January 27 and February 3<sup>1</sup> the Dutch Embassy formulated its suspicions with a cynicism at once justifiable in itself and humiliating to English pride. The Ambassadors appear to have attacked the English Ministers as well singly as in their collective capacity, reiterating the rumours of a collusion between the Kings which had become rife both here and upon the Continent. The results of this diplomatic importunity proved, however, meagre in the extreme. Lord Halifax, so the Dutchmen admit,<sup>2</sup> showed himself 'disposed to the summons of a Parliament;' but even he 'inclined to minimise the dangers of a brief delay,' and intimated that his Majesty was at a stay until he 'should be fully conversant with the views of their High Mightinesses as regards the *via media* proposed by M. Barillon.

At the more formal conferences meanwhile both the Spaniard and his Dutch confederates rejected with indignation the suggested compromise, and solemnly demanded that the King of England should discharge the obligations which he had assumed during the preceding October. They recalled his Majesty's promise to resent, as an infringement of the peace, the prosecution '*par voie de fait*' of the French encroachments in the Netherlands, and his pledge, no less precise, that on the failure of pacific representations he would retort with the summons of a Parliament. They dismissed with becoming contempt the consideration of M. Barillon's memorial, which, as the Spaniard observed, involved the sacrifice of Luxembourg rather than its preservation; they pressed, with an almost imperious urgency, the necessity for an immediate session, if only as a guarantee of good faith;

<sup>1</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, ff. 18-43. The interminable verbosity of these despatches fully confirms Dr. Burnet's description of Van Beuning's conversational volubility.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* f. 22b.

1681<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> and while taunting the English, in terms more or less diplomatic, upon the decline of the national credit, they exclaimed that 'there did not appear to be an Englishman who could patiently acquiesce in conduct so timid on the part of so great a crown.'

The English Commissioners, by the mouth of Lord Halifax, responded<sup>1</sup> to the following effect: 'That the affair seemed to be otherwise regarded than was justified by the facts of the case; that (since the memorial [of M. Barillon] might be considered in the light of an answer) his Majesty naturally desired to take the opinion of the States ere proceeding to a further determination; and that all the difficulties and inconveniences alleged [by the Dutchmen] had not been substantiated. That their Excellencies, however, having transmitted a punctual report to his Majesty, would subsequently announce his decision; and that it might perhaps become feasible so to arrange, as that the King of France, on the representations of his Britannic Majesty, should concede the point by raising the blockade of Luxembourg.' The Dutchmen astutely observed that M. Barillon's memorial, if really a rejoinder, was in fact an absolute repudiation of the English demands. The Court of St. James—confronted, as it were, by the horns of its own dilemma temporised anew, referring the counter-memorial rather to the category of *propositions* than to that of definitive replies.

The views thus formulated by his Commissioners were endorsed by Charles in a very curt response, with the significant rider that he did not regard himself as obliged to summon his Parliament at the discretion of his Allies. The Dutchmen, though bitterly mortified, saw the expediency of pitching their expostulations in a somewhat lower key; but while they apologised, so to say, for the unconventional vehemence of their language, the substance of their importunate reproaches underwent little modification.<sup>2</sup>

Throughout England meanwhile the extreme urgency of the crisis was fully appreciated, and public anxiety appeared unusually alive to the gravity of the issues involved. It was no secret that grave divergencies of opinion existed in Ministerial circles. 'Now,' says Sir John Reresby,<sup>3</sup> 'was the great expectation whether a

<sup>1</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax, for reasons of health, was absent from the final conference, <sup>January 30</sup> <sup>February 9</sup>

<sup>3</sup> January 28, *Memoirs* (1875), p. 234.

Parliament would be called or not, the Ministers of State not agreeing in the thing. My Lord Halifax argued for it for these reasons—that all Christendom desired it, France only excepted, and nothing ought to discourage it at home, but the fear that they might fly upon high points, which, if they did, the King might dismiss or dissolve them when he pleased, and show the world that it was their fault, not his, that he endeavoured to give satisfaction to his people by frequent Parliaments.<sup>1</sup> But if the King and they agreed, his Majesty would then gain the great point to be united at home, and formidable abroad. Seymour and Hyde, adds Sir John, ‘that were more in the Duke’s interest, were against it, fearing that not only the succession, but themselves, might be attacked in the next Parliament.’

1681

Meanwhile even French ingenuity had reached its term, and the acknowledgment of the memorial presented through Henry Savile could be no longer postponed. The State paper in which the reply was embodied seems to have reached England on February 11, its despatch ranking among the last official acts of the returning Envoy. In substance it constituted an unequivocal refusal to suspend operations before Luxembourg.<sup>2</sup> The Dutchmen

<sup>1</sup> His arguments correspond very nearly with those employed by the Dutch Ambassadors.

*Savile Correspondence*, p. 261 note; *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, February 11, and the two following letters from Lord Halifax to his brother:—*The Earl of Halifax to Henry Savile*. London, <sup>Feb. 20,</sup> March 2, '81. 2. I saw the King sign your letters of revocation this night; and Mr. Secretary promiseth to send them away by this post, so that I hope you will come over as soon as ever you receive them, all other impediments being so fully removed. My Lady Portsmouth intendeth to begin her journey, as I hear, the 2<sup>d</sup> week in March, by which time you may be here if you have a mind to make haste home. . . . (*Savile Correspondence*, letter ccvii., p. 267. The rest of this letter will be found upon p. 351.) *The Same to the Same*. —<sup>Feb. 20,</sup> March 2, '81. 2. It was not for want of pressing that your letters of revocation did not come sooner to you; and I assure you there was some difficulty in getting them at all till my L<sup>d</sup> Preston went over; but I thought I did you a good office in several respects in getting your leave to return before he set out. My Lady Portsmouth beginneth her journey on Wednesday, so that it will be at your choice whether you will meet her upon the road, or, like a more civil gentleman, stay at Paris *pour faire les honneurs*: though, since you have disposed all things for your return, and pack'd up your goods in order to it, I do not see how you can delay your journey without some diminution to your character; but of this you are the best judge. I am in expectation of the book you have bought for me, because you know my taste well enough to guess what I shall be pleased with, though I was a little startled with the sound of six volumes. The Spanish proverb often cometh in my mind, *es descredito el mucho*; but I am tyed to no opinion without allowing some exceptions, especially in this case where your own person is such an instance that there may be a great deal of what is very good. Adieu.' (*Savile Correspondence*, letter ccviii., p. 268.)

16<sup>41</sup><sub>42</sub> hereupon contended, and with the most apparent justice, that the contingency contemplated by the agreement of the preceding October had now emphatically occurred. Charles, however, disingenuously denied that the message of Louis involved an absolute negative, and professed his intention of awaiting the response of the States to M. Barillon's suggestion. On February  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>0</sup> the said response<sup>1</sup> arrived, wherein the States practically declined all discussion of an expedient upon which the Escorial alone could have a title to pronounce; and the despatch concluded with a specific request for the summons of the promised Parliament. Charles in his turn stigmatised this language as evasive, and raised a side issue by audacious recriminations. He complained of aspersions current at The Hague which accused him of French proclivities. Upon this topic both Seymour and Halifax<sup>2</sup> remonstrated with the Ambassadors, by whom they were assured that their High Mightinesses had merely hinted their fears lest his Britannic Majesty, however unwittingly, should play into the hands of France. Van Beuning, we find, took this occasion to claim with peculiar earnestness the assistance of Lord Halifax himself whose 'loyalty' to the common interest Van Beuning here, as elsewhere, so specially notes—and the response of the Earl was as immediate as it was cordial.

For a month the situation remained practically unaltered.<sup>3</sup> Spain continued to refuse the sacrifice required at her hands; the Allies continued to urge upon Charles the redemption of pledges so repeatedly given. The English King continued to reaffirm that in the state of his affairs an immediate session was impossible; that only a formal rupture between France and Spain could entail the obligation; and that in his opinion an arrangement between France and Spain on the lines suggested by M. Barillon's memorial would alone save the situation. Affairs therefore had reached an absolute deadlock.

Suddenly, however, about March  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>7</sup> an unexpected solution occurred; Louis XIV. solemnly announced<sup>4</sup> through M. Barillon that, in view of the alarming progress made in Hungary by the Turkish infidels, he was

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677. vol. TTT, ff. 44, 45.

<sup>2</sup> February  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>0</sup> (despatch of that date) and  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>1</sup> (despatch of February  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>1</sup>).

<sup>3</sup> See the voluminous despatches of Van Beuning.

<sup>4</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Open)*, March  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>7</sup>, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677. vol. FF,; and *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, March  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>7</sup>, *ibid.* vol. TTT, f. 106.

prepared not only to raise the siege of Luxembourg, but also to submit the questions at issue between himself and Spain to the arbitrage of the English King. 16<sup>41</sup><sub>25</sub>

All circumstances of the case considered, the pretext of magnanimity can only be described as transparent, and the real motives of this theatrical abnegation were eagerly canvassed. The States Ambassadors and, it would appear, the Spaniard himself referred the forbearance of his Majesty to the determined attitude which the States, under pressure from the Prince of Orange, were somewhat tardily assuming; and the Dutch despatches satirically observe that in the French King's announcement no allusion occurs to the remonstrances of the English King.<sup>1</sup> Lord Halifax, on the other hand, specifically ascribes the step to the action of Charles. 'The true [of [the French King's] retiring' (so he writes, some three years later, in the 'Character of a Trimmer') 'is worth our observation; for at the instance of the Confederates, offices were done, and Memorials given, but all ineffectual till the word *Parliament* was put into them. That powerful word had such an effect that even at that distance it raised the siege: which may convince us of what efficacy the King of England's words are, when he will give them their full weight, and threaten with his Parliament.' This very explicit assertion admits of but one interpretation. King Charles, we must suppose, while ostensibly repudiating his obligations, did actually, though privately<sup>2</sup> (and, we may presume, under pressure from Lord Halifax) convey to the French Court an intimation that, unless the siege should be raised, he could no longer resist the force of public opinion.

This statement of Lord Halifax, made at a subsequent period, is apparently substantiated as well by the expressions of Lords Hyde and Conway, of the Duke, and of Charles himself<sup>3</sup> as by the contemporary declarations of Lord Halifax. A few days after the eventful announce-

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatch (Secret)* of March 7<sup>th</sup>, correcting the *Despatch (Open)* of March 17<sup>th</sup>. The Spaniards also assigned the French retirement to the firmness of the States (*Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, July 24<sup>th</sup>, 1682, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 171b).

<sup>2</sup> As late as March 7<sup>th</sup>, ten days before the decision of Louis reached England, the Dutchmen wrote that no one gave any hopes of a Parliament (*Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 95).

<sup>3</sup> See British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 334. [The *Dutch Despatch (Open)* of March 17<sup>th</sup> also says 'that the King and his Ministers maintain they are absolved from the charge of breach of faith, because his Majesty (so they say) did not positively refuse to call his Parliament, and that his last answer was he would not prove false to his pledges . . .



1682 ment the Earl had a long conversation with the Dutch Ambassadors (<sup>March 28</sup>~~April 7~~ [?]).<sup>1</sup>

The Lord Earl of Hollifax (they write) is . . . returned from Newmarket,<sup>2</sup> and has informed us ; that, since his Majesty understands that his good and sincere intentions towards the furtherance of the best interest of his allies, and the establishment of the peace of Christendom, are not acknowledged as his Majesty had reason to expect ; but that on the contrary his conduct has been criticised as if his Majesty should be of another mind than that which ought to result from the alliances he has contracted, and the pledges he has given ; and seeing that, upon this point, both here and abroad the most indecent discourses had been current (insinuating, even, that ways and means must be found, for compelling his Majesty to take perforce a new and better departure :) his Lordship was charged to inform us, and the ambassador of Spain, how hard this appeared ; and that his Majesty trusted he had deserved a better censure of his conduct ; which, to all appearance, could not be refused him by any who should be properly mindful of the fact, that his Majesty towards the end of the preceding autumn, at the instance of the States, had declared his intention, not only of fulfilling the treaties contracted with Spain, and of summoning his Parliament for this purpose, in case hostilities continued in the Spanish Netherlands ; but also of entering into a guarantee of the peace of Westphalia, and consequently of all that concerned the peace of the German Empire : that his Majesty's good intentions having had no effect in the last mentioned instance, by reason of the disinclination evinced in several of the German Courts, to enter into a common engagement for the guarantee of the treaties of Nimeguen and Westphalia, he with the States, had striven to move the King of France in favour of some reasonable decision tending to the preservation of the peace with Spain ;

that he had done his best for Luxembourg, making *all the most suitable insinuations concerning consequences* : and that while he aims at the general good, he thinks his own way best, and more efficacious than an immediate session of Parliament. That he is absolutely determined to act, as to foreign affairs, in concert with the States, and indeed it can hardly be expressed with how great demonstrations of cordiality both my lord Hollifax and my lord Conway spoke to us in this sense.' In the *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* of July 7, 1682, and January 1, 1683, Charles is represented as pluming himself on the relief of Luxembourg. *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* of October 5, 1683, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 554b, give a conversation between the Dutch representative and (Hyde) Lord Rochester. The former appears to have said that if Charles would act as in the case of Luxembourg all further difficulty would be obviated. Rochester answered : '*Sir that is to say, that the King must call his Parliament, since it was the threat of calling his Parliament that raised the siege.*' (For Conway, see *Naval Correspondence*, p. 265, note ; for the Duke of York, see Macpherson, i. 124.)

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* of that day, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, ff. 113, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Reresby, March 26.

and that the first instances having proved ineffectual, his Majesty had been called upon to fulfill his promise concerning the assembling of a Parliament; that he had, indeed, formed an impression (having regard to the state which Spanish affairs had reached in the Netherlands and elsewhere, and to other considerations connected with his internal affairs), that the possibility of an accommodation ought to be canvassed; but that his Majesty had never refused to summon his Parliament, having professed to [the representatives of the States], by word of mouth, his intention of fulfilling his pledges, though he did not feel himself bound to the immediate session so precisely demanded for reasons submitted to that purpose; that meanwhile his Majesty *had not refrained from employing the most forcible instances,<sup>1</sup> as regards the King of France in pursuance of the common object, having announced that his Majesty would lie under a positive necessity of acting up to his alliances after another fashion*: And that matters have reached a point, whereat one may hope for the preservation of peace without any resort to extremities; so as we may assure the States that his Majesty will never swerve from those measures concerted with them regarding the common security, or from the treaties contracted for that purpose; since he remains inclined to enter into the most sincere, complete, and cordial confidence with the States, in the interests of the common security, intending to direct his counsels, and to deliberate, in reciprocal confidence, concerning the common weal.

The answer of the Ambassadors was somewhat dry, and they appear to have insinuated a rather unflattering parallel between the recent action of England and that of the States. Lord Halifax answered 'that his Majesty did not desire to reproach others, but to justify himself;' and in conclusion, say the Dutchmen, 'the noble Lord demonstrated, that there is here no inclination either to take, or to retain offence; but that this Court merely expects to be regarded as having deserved well, in relation to the common concern, and as having furthered the same: with large protestations that his Majesty will steadily assist the States to pursue the same.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Dehoien.'

<sup>2</sup> Upon this topic we find Halifax further agreeing with the Dutch Ambassadors (*Despatches Secret*), April 3, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 110) that their existing instructions are superseded by the French *volle-face* in regard to Luxembourg, 'excepting always the endeavour to conclude the differences in Germany, which, like the States, they here desired (as did his Excellency) might be effected by dexterous management.' Lord Halifax, however, seems to have agreed with the Court in general that, under the circumstances, for Charles to enter into the League of Guarantee before the conclusion of an accommodation would only exasperate France (<sup>April 21</sup> <sup>May 1</sup> and <sup>April 25</sup> <sup>May 1</sup>, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, ff. 130, 132).

1682 In a similar strain, a few days later, Lord Halifax wrote to the Prince of Orange :—

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>1</sup>

I had not given your Highnesse so much respite, but that the things which have happened, since I writ last, might appear so ill and give you such an impression of us here that I did not know but, whilst that dissatisfaction remained in your mind, I might bee involved in it, and therefore nothing could bee more welcome than the assurance your Highnesse is pleased to give mee that I am stil in possession of the same place in your favorable thoughts you have ever afforded mee. I am the same man in relation to the publique, and am yet lesse to bee altered in my respects to your Highnesse in particular, and, as one of the greatest obligations I could possibly receive, was the openness and freedome you were pleased to use towards mee at Windsor; s<sup>o</sup> I lament my ill memory, in not being able to recall to my mind that particular of which you give mee a hint in your letter, so that it would bee a welcome favour to give mee some further light in it, especially if it is of such a nature that it may either bee of use, to your Highnesse or to mysel<sup>e</sup>, that I should remember it. In the mean time it is unnecessary for mee to lay before you that the posture of things is extreemly changed, since what hath passed at Luxembourg: which, as it is a great step towards the establishment of the publique peace, so I hope it will bee improved, as much as may bee, in order to that end, and since the King hath had such a part in bringing this about, hee deserveth all imaginable encouragements from his Allyes, who are the more obliged to do him right in this, by their having been so hard upon him in their censures, before hee gave this evidence of his zeale for the preservation of Flanders. Your Highnesse will, I am sure, not bee wanting in this, because it is not onely a justice and a respect, in neither of which you can ever layle, but that it is really of a publique consequence that his Ma. and your Highnesse should in all circumstances bee intirely satisfied with one another. I am the more earnest in this, from the knowledge I have how much dependeth upon it, and therefore, since it proceedeth from so good a meaning, I am sure you will forgive mee, if I moove your Highnesse, when you write next to the King, to take some paines to rectify all mistakes and to excuse anything that might bear an unkind interpretation; there is as much zeale in this as in a greater service, and so I hope it will bee accepted from one that is so much devoted to you.

London, April 4 1682.

Louis meanwhile had but drawn back to leap the better; *the arbitration had been originally suggested by Charles*

<sup>1</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. 547, April 4.

as a means of awarding Luxembourg to France.<sup>1</sup> Spain, 1682 suspecting some such collusion, showed no alacrity to accept the offer.

*The Earl of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*"

"Your Highnesse will have had an account from M<sup>r</sup> van Beuninghen how the King received your letter," which I was very glad to see; though perhaps hee did not consent to every particular expression in it, upon the whole it must have a good effect, by shewing his Majesty that you take paines to satisfy him, and are desirous to remoove the occasions of misunderstanding which may have arisen in the late transactions between you. I am sure nothing under heaven is so necessary for the preservation of Christendome as that there may bee an intire union of interests and such a perfect confidence as shall bee above the danger of being lessened or undermined by those who would prevent the good effects of it. In order to this, I do, out of the fulnesse of my heart, beg leave to offer this caution to you that you must take away the possibility of the Kings being persuaded that any who are known to bee contrary to his interests here, can have any credit or influence with your Highnesse; for such an apprehension, once admitted into his mind so as to take root in it, would destroy the inclinations hee otherwise must have to meet and cherish your friendship;<sup>4</sup> you must forgive mee, if I own my fears that your Highnesses generosity in being slow and unwilling to beleve ill of men, may have rendred you more lyable to bee misled and misinformed in our affayres here, by some<sup>5</sup> that are too much swayed by their particuler interests to represent things truly to you, and this appeareth so much clearer to the world every day that I am perswaded, if your Highnesse saw it as wee do, you would bee convinced that even the best things they pretend are promoted and pressed by them for ill ends, and from reasons that are not justifiable. I do not say this out of any particuler sharpnesse of my own towards men that may have

<sup>1</sup> Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, p. 93 (Barillon, Dec. 25, 1681).

<sup>2</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Documents*, 2nd series, vol. v., p. 552, June 2.

<sup>3</sup> Not extant; apparently a result of the Earl's remonstrance (*ante*, p. 318).

<sup>4</sup> See the *Dutch Despatches* of March 2<sup>n</sup>, for a conversation with a friendly Minister (possibly Halifax himself), who, though he would have willingly seen the success of their solicitation, and had been helpful to them, complained that the Dutch by their vehemence never advanced their cause, and did their best to embitter the King, 'and give occasion for differences which were fostered by those who disliked the newly cemented understanding between the King and the States; and that it would eventually prove very injurious to both, and that this was the more to be apprehended because the King had been taught that this pressure was employed at the instance and upon the advice of people here, who are ill disposed towards this court; and that they appeared to have greater weight in the United Provinces themselves than behoves, if there is any becoming anxiety to retain the friendship and affection of the King' (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 84b).

<sup>5</sup> Probably Sunderland and Henry Sidney.

1682 used mee unkindly, but as it is a great truth, which I affirme with the same indifferency as if I never had any occasion to complayne of them. Mens expectations are for the present suspended, till the answer cometh from Spayne concerning the arbitration, which being accepted by the King for good ends, will I hope bee so interpreted by his Allies.<sup>1</sup> The Kings recovery from a small distemper putteth every body here in good humour, and will, I am sure, bee welcome newes to your Highnesse, to whose favorable thoughts I most humbly recommend mysele.

Windsor, June 2, 1682.

We must now retrace our steps a little, since our anxiety to elucidate the successive stages of the European complication has led us to anticipate somewhat the general progress of events. The relief of Luxembourg (accepting, as we do, the Earl's explanation) constitutes the sole triumph of the Halifax episode; for the Ministerial preponderance of Lord Halifax, illusory as in the main it had been, now drew to a close. The Duke of York was agitating with renewed persistence for his own recall, and resented with almost equal bitterness the Minister's opposition to this suggestion,<sup>2</sup> his anxiety for

<sup>1</sup> It appears that from the first Charles wished, or professed to wish, the States should be admitted as joint arbiters. This proposal France peremptorily rejected; but Charles expressed to the States his intention of consulting them informally. Lord Halifax added, that the States might now clearly perceive, from his Majesty's frank expressions, what consideration his Majesty evinced for them' (*Dutch Despatches Secret*, March 7, April 7, 11, and May 7, Brit. Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, ff. 108, 120, 125, 136).

<sup>2</sup> 'I never could understand his politiks,' wrote James angrily to Legge, 'and am sure they were never calculated for the meridian of a monarchy, and tho he be such a hero in a House of Lords, and has a tongue which makes him considered there, he is lesse then other men out of his sphere, and will I doubt run the King into those inconveniencies that I feare will be fatal to the Crowne, and even to his Lordship to, tho he does not thinke it. I am glad Lord Hyde has found him out' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 40, in answer to one of December 6 [misdated 1679]). Halifax, in his letters to the Duke, retorted that 'he hop'd his Highness would believe that whatever opinion he had concerning his return, it sprung from no other motive but his apprehension that it was neither for the King's service, nor his own, to come at an unseasonable time; nor would he allow himself to suspect, he said, that those with whom he differ'd in this matter had gain'd any advantage upon him in his Highnesse's opinion, but that he will pleas to let him have the same place in it he ever thought fitt for him, when he was most satisfyd with his endeavours to serve (*sic*) him and his zeal for his right' (*Life of James II.*, i. 719). Upon December 4 Beresby (*Memoirs*, p. 226) had told the Earl that the world reported him adverse to the Duke's interest and opposed to his return. Halifax had responded, 'That it was well if the Duke's being too hasty in that matter did not turn to his injury; that he had a sort of hungry servants about him that were still pressing his return, and would never let him alone till, out of interest to themselves, they put him upon that which would turn to the prejudice of their master by the ill-timing of it . . . there was great partiality in the judgment of men as to his particular, for in justice they should as well

a meeting of Parliament,<sup>1</sup> his advocacy of a breach with France,<sup>2</sup> and the conciliatory policy towards both 'Whigs' and Protestant Dissenters of which he was the champion.<sup>3</sup> 1682

During the course of the winter, moreover, and the circumstance redounds highly to the credit of the statesman, affairs in Scotland had created a fresh breach between Lord Halifax and the Duke. Urged by the greedy and unscrupulous enemies of the Earl of Argyll, and inspired, one fears, by motives of personal revenge,<sup>4</sup> James, early in December, had perpetrated the most crying injustice of his life, by countenancing the iniquitous prosecution of the Earl for high treason. At the instance of Burnet, Lord Halifax from the first expostulated with the King upon this point: he actually consented to co-operate in the matter with Argyll's kinsman, the dying Lauderdale,<sup>5</sup> and it was currently reported in Scotland<sup>6</sup> that Lord Halifax had told Charles II. to his face 'he knew not the Scots law, but by the law of England that Explanation<sup>7</sup> could not hang his dog.'<sup>8</sup> Lord Halifax soon assured himself, indeed, that James did not intend the crowning wickedness of an execution;<sup>9</sup> but he was almost equally

take notice of things done to the advantage of the Duke as what appeared to be otherwise; but nobody commended the ministers' (for the dismissal of Monmouth from his last remaining office) 'which would prove a great bar to his return near the King, and the greatest service one could do to his highness was to prevent the Duke of Monmouth's coming to Court.' (See also York to Legge [*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, pp. 46, 48, January 19, 26, misdated 1673.])

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 73, February 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 44, January 5.

<sup>3</sup> The letter of January 12 (*ibid.* p. 41) refers to a report that Halifax and other great men had had interviews with Shaftesbury. 'The other Ministers appear to have insinuated that 'his Lordship look'd back to his old politicks, and the making himself popular again; . . . his declaring at this time against prosecuting dissenters' was considered 'no small Symptom of it' (*Life of James II.*, i. 718-19).

<sup>4</sup> It has been stated that Argyll had aroused the resentment of James (1) by a proviso against Romanists, which he had attempted to insert in a public Act; (2) by refusing, when sounded, to promise his support to James in the event of a civil war. We have mislaid the references.

<sup>5</sup> Burnet, ii. 319.

<sup>6</sup> Fountainhall, *Historical Observes.* p. 55.

The reservation with which he had taken a newly imposed test, and which was the only evidence adduced upon the indictment. Laingard, who may be acquitted of excessive sympathy for a Presbyterian, observes that the only criticism which can be passed upon the Explanation is that it appears superfluous, and necessarily contained within the intention of the Act.

<sup>7</sup> Hamilton had written to Burnet for his opinion concerning the test. Burnet himself thought that there was no valid objection to taking it, and strongly urged Hamilton to do so if his conscience permitted. 'For lord Halifax assured me, that he was looked on as a man that was setting himself at the head of the party in opposition to the government, and he might easily foresee what the consequence of that would be' (Burnet, ii. 316, edit. 1830; suppressed in first edition).

<sup>8</sup> Burnet, ii. 321. Halifax had seen the Duke's letter to the King.

1682 disgusted by the policy which could subject an innocent man and a loyal servant<sup>1</sup> to the agony of a capital conviction as the means of filching his estates. And when, apprehending the immediate execution of his sentence, the Earl had broken prison, Lord Halifax renewed his solicitations on behalf of Lord Lorne.<sup>2</sup> They had little effect save as exasperating the Duke of York, who highly resented the statesman's 'meddling,' and was anxious to conduct his correspondence with the English Court through the medium of Hyde alone. But Lord Halifax, 'looking upon himself as the privie Minister,' composedly returned that nothing ought to be done without his knowledge: 'It not being possible to govern one ship if he knew not what cours the other Steer'd.'<sup>3</sup> As usual, at this juncture Charles apparently acquiesced; and James, though bitterly mortified, dared not break with the Minister.<sup>4</sup>

As the spring advanced, however, and his impatience to return increased, the Duke found it necessary to employ another influence in his favour; and by working on the cupidity of the Duchess of Portsmouth—with whom Lord Halifax, though he had been compelled by Royal command to attend the King to her lodgings, was on the worst possible terms—the Duke obtained leave to pay his respects at Court. He reached Newmarket on March 6; and on the 17th Halifax went thither, Sir John Reresby by special desire accepting a seat in his coach.<sup>5</sup> The Earl spoke much and freely on the way; he had recently complained 'of some hardships he lay under in the administration of public concerns from the great indiscretions of

<sup>1</sup> It is rather absurd to speak of Argyll at this juncture as a *Whig*. He was in reality an embarrassed and somewhat tyrannical Highland grandee, who, although himself of more moderate sentiments, and inclined to Presbytery, had for years acted, during his rare irruptions into the political sphere, with his kinsman Lauderdale. The scandalous cupidity of the Middleton-Montrose group, his hereditary enemies, who hoped for the forfeiture of his estates, was the real motive of the crime.

<sup>2</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 711, 712.

<sup>3</sup> We know not on what authority the continuator of Mackintosh ('History of England' in Lardner's *Cyclopædia*, vii. 304) makes Halifax, with Hyde, Seymour, and Godolphin, responsible for the inculcation of a policy of severe coercion in a letter which had appointed James Commissioner.

<sup>4</sup> In some 'private discourse,' about January 1, Halifax told Reresby 'that those that belonged to the Duke of York made him mad, for that there were few amongst them that had common sense' (p. 231).

<sup>5</sup> 'My Lord Halifax is lately reconciled to her interest, at least so far as to visit her and attend y<sup>e</sup> King to her lodgings, w<sup>ch</sup> formerly he never would, and this too, they say, by y<sup>e</sup> King's positive command' (*Hatton Correspondence*, ii. 11, December 6, 1681). 'November 18 . . . the King made them friends that day outwardly, but not thoroughly, for that was impossible, they going upon two so different interests' (Reresby).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 243-245.

some near the King; whom, notwithstanding the King very well knew and laughed at in private, yet entrusted in great affairs;’ and he now confided to Reresby the correspondence he had formerly held with the Duke on the subject of his religion, but added that, despite this freedom, he ‘doubted not but his highness would receive him with kindness.’ In all he said, exclaims the admiring Reresby, the statesman expressed ‘the wonted goodness, honour, and discretion, with which he always both spoke and acted; for certainly there never lived a man in the world of more wit and judgment.’<sup>1</sup>

The Earl and his companion reached Newmarket at noon the following day, and shared the same lodgings till their return on the 26th.<sup>2</sup> After great ‘outward expressions of respect and kindness,’ says Reresby, the Duke of York granted Lord Halifax ‘a long private audience.’ The Minister frankly asked<sup>3</sup> ‘whether he was to ap[pe]ar before’ the Duke ‘as a criminal or no?’ But James, ‘receiv’d him so graciously, and seem’d by his great attention to his good offices not to remember the ill ones, that my Lord was rassured, and shew’d to be entirely satisfyd with his reception, tho in the bottom he was neither changed in his opinion nor his conduct’—a circumstance which at once transpired by his urging, though quite ineffectually, that the Duke should receive immediate orders to retrace his steps.

The following letter, written by Lord Halifax just after his visit to Newmarket, refers to a contemporary tragedy—the murder of Mr. Thynne of Longleat, at the instigation of Count Königsmarek—through which Sir Thomas Thynne of Drayton, the friend and cousin of Lord Halifax, succeeded to the Longleat estates.

Lady Elizabeth Percy, one of the richest heiresses in England (contracted in childhood to Lord Ogle, who died a child<sup>4</sup>), seems to have been only sixteen when she was entrapped by her relations, against her will, into a second contract with Mr. Thynne, commonly called ‘Tom o’ Ten

<sup>1</sup> There is a letter from Reresby to Halifax, dated December 10, 1681, in the *Bodleian MSS.*, Rawlinson D. 201, f. 80 (Reresby’s own note book). He asks a favour, insinuates that he had been early conscious of Halifax’s merit, and had made himself ‘criminal’ thereby in the eyes of Danby, and expresses his wish to serve at once under one he loves and trusts, who may by-and-by think fit (though Reresby hopes he may never see that day) ‘to decline that weight of business that is upon y<sup>e</sup>.’

<sup>2</sup> Reresby, p. 241. He gives an amusing picture of the crowd and discomfort.

<sup>3</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 728.

<sup>4</sup> See *ante*, p. 310, note 5.



1682 'Thousand.' She fled to Holland, and instituted proceedings against Thynne in the ecclesiastical courts on the plea that his marriage was barred by a pre-contract.<sup>1</sup> Henry Sidney was an accomplice in her escape—a fact evidently connected with the desire of the Stadtholder to secure so wealthy an heiress for a Dutch noble.<sup>2</sup> The case still depended when, on February 12, 1682, Mr. Thynne was murdered while driving down Pall Mall by four bravos, at the instigation of Count Königsmarek, a disappointed suitor.<sup>3</sup> While Mr. Thynne's intimacy with the Duke of Monmouth had led some to regard his murder as a political crime, it was feared, on the other hand, that suspicion might fall upon Sir Thomas Thynne, his heir-at-law; and in consequence both Sir Thomas and his kinsman, Lord Halifax, took great interest in the prosecution.<sup>4</sup>

On <sup>February 20</sup> <sup>March 2</sup> the Marquis had written to Henry Savile: 'I will not repeat anything concerning the murderers of Mr. Thynne, but that this day Count Königsmarek was taken at Gravesend; and upon his examination the appearances are so much against him that he is sent to my Lord Chief Justice, who probably will lodge him in Newgate. Sir T. Thynne is come to town to help to prosecute . . .'<sup>5</sup>

Lady Ogle returned from Holland before March 10,<sup>6</sup> and there is an amusing letter from Sir William Coventry to Lord Halifax, describing the rush of suitors by which the ill-fated young lady was already besieged.<sup>7</sup> Sir Thomas meanwhile appears to have been keenly interested in the question of the Thynne jointure, to which, as the contract had not been dissolved, Lady Ogle was supposed to retain a technical right.

*The Earl of Halifax to Sir Thomas Thynne.*<sup>8</sup>

London March 29 81.\*

At my returne from Newmarket I found yours from Longleat, where it seemed you have at last got possession; to what

<sup>1</sup> See *Walpoliana*, ii. 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Diary of Henry Sidney* (edit. Blencowe), ii. 222-226.

<sup>3</sup> *Reresby*, &c.

<sup>4</sup> *Reresby*.

<sup>5</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 267. Königsmarek escaped—as was supposed, by bribery; his agents were executed.

<sup>6</sup> *Luttrell*, i. 172.

<sup>7</sup> February 27 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]).

<sup>8</sup> *Longleat MSS.* (erroneously endorsed, in pencil, 'Coventry, Sir W.'). The hand and seal (an owl with a coronet) reveal the real writer. It was addressed 'For Sr T. Thinne at Longleat—to bee left at Frome Wiltshire.'

\* Really '1682.' As the year then began with March 25, the error is an easy one.

end it was ever denied you I cannot imagine, and I cannot see how they can redeem their ill manners by any thing so well, as the allowing you a good pennyworth on the goods. I told you my opinion in my last letter, that it was advisable for you to come up, and fix my Lady Ogles generosity whilst it is warme; It is a vertue that often cooleth upon second thoughts, and you will hereafter bee thought wanting to your selfe, if by losing this criticall time, you should hereafter pay 1500<sup>l</sup> a year but since you say there is an absolute necessity for your going to Drayton, I have no more to say, but am to leave it to your own better iudgement. my Lady Ogle lyveth alone in Northumberland house, where I beleeve she will bee as much courted by her severall friends, to have the selling of her,<sup>1</sup> as shce can bee by her most passionate pretenders of another kind<sup>2</sup> I hear this day that the King hath given the Duke leave to send for the Dutchesse,<sup>3</sup> and that it is intended shce should come by sea. iust now my brother is come an l presenteth his service to you.

I am Dear S<sup>r</sup>

for ever

Yours<sup>1</sup> •

On May 3 accordingly the Duke went North to fetch his wife, and while he was away upon this errand a circumstance occurred which illustrates, after a somewhat amusing fashion, how general and various was the obloquy to which Lord Halifax was exposed by the independence of his political attitude. The Duke of Monmouth had seized the opportunity afforded by his uncle's renewed absence to make certain overtures towards his father which were refused. This check the young man evidently, though erroneously, referred to the influence of Lord Halifax, who had recently favoured the dismissal of his Grace from the one Court office in which he had not, so far, been definitely superseded. On the Sunday ensuing (May 21), as the worshippers left St. Martin's Church, the young Duke, while still within the consecrated precincts, accosted the Minister, and, requesting him to step aside, inquired in a heated manner why his lordship had moved the King in Council for a proclamation forbidding all persons to keep the Duke of Monmouth company. 'Pray,' retorted Halifax, 'who told your Grace I had done so?'

<sup>1</sup> Alluding to the disgraceful intrigues which had preceded the contract with Mr. Thynne.

<sup>2</sup> Within three months she married the Duke of Somerset. (See the virulent satire of Swift known as the *Windsor Prophecy*, which, it is said, cost him a bishopric; it is given in Blencowe, ii. 225, note.)

<sup>3</sup> I.e. to settle in England.

<sup>1</sup> Unsigned.

<sup>5</sup> The King, incensed at a passage in his application, had forbidden his servants to consort with the Duke.

1682 This information the Duke refused to communicate; upon which Lord Halifax rejoined, 'Then since your Grace is upon those terms I do not think fit to tell your Grace, whether I made such a motion or no.' The Duke of Monmouth hereupon completely lost his self-command; he proceeded with much asperity to intimate that his lordship's society at least could be well dispensed with: and added, with a threatening accent, that elsewhere he could have expressed himself more plainly. His lordship retorted that he should be happy to resume the subject when, where, and in what manner his Grace should please.

So public an altercation between men of standing naturally attracted very considerable attention, and a duel appeared to impend. Sir John Reresby at once placed his services at the disposal of the Earl in case 'any more happened upon it.' Lord Halifax made answer that 'if • that were he would make use of somebody he esteemed less,<sup>1</sup> . . . but did not conceive himself obliged to fight<sup>2</sup> upon that account, though he should be ready to defend himself,<sup>3</sup> for he carried a sword by his side.' The affair, however, went no further. The King, highly incensed, compelled Lord Halifax to retail the occurrence in Council, and while exonerating the Earl from all responsibility for the proposed motion endorsed his own former prohibition. The young Duke, on calmer reflection, became convinced that his suspicions had been mistaken, and thus the storm in the tea-cup quietly subsided.<sup>4</sup> The relations of Monmouth with the Opposition became, however, in consequence more intimate, if possible, than before.

Another incident which belongs to the spring of this year, although probably political in its origin, seems rather the offspring of an elvish spirit of mischief than of real political malignity. Funeral tickets, we are told, were dispersed some time in February to many of the principal nobility, requesting them to send their coaches with six horses, to 'accompany the body of George Earl

<sup>1</sup> The seconds, in a seventeenth-century duel, often fought as desperately as their principals.

<sup>2</sup> Obviously 'to challenge.'

<sup>3</sup> I.e. to accept a challenge if offered.

<sup>4</sup> See for this incident Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 654; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 3-2; British Museum Add. MSS. 28,569 f. 36; Reresby, May 22 (erroneously printed 12) and May 23, pp. 250, 251; *Dutch Despatches* (Open), <sup>May 26,</sup> June 5, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 242.

of Halifax out of town.'<sup>1</sup> History does not relate 1682 whether the appeal was largely successful, or whether the witty victim appreciated this practical insinuation of his impending political extinction.

PART III.—ASCENDENCY OF THE DUKE OF YORK,  
MARCH 1682—AUGUST 1684.

The anticipations of those politicians to whom Lord Halifax was obnoxious appear to have been more correct than the impressions which he had himself received. On May 9 Sir John Reresby<sup>2</sup> had found the Minister 'very steady for a Parliament, and of opinion' that the Duke had got no advantage in the King's good opinion by his journey into England. The hopes of Lord Halifax were, however, entirely frustrated by the event. On May 27, 1682, after an extremely hazardous voyage, which had gone very near to settle, in a fashion sufficiently tragic, the question of the English succession,<sup>3</sup> the Duke of York, accompanied by his family, returned from Scotland, and the reappearance of his Royal Highness on the scene inaugurated to much effect the new era prognosticated by public opinion. From this moment Lord Halifax ceased to be, either in appearance or in reality, the principal Minister.<sup>4</sup> Ostensibly Lord Hyde, the Duke's favourite, bore the brunt of affairs;<sup>5</sup> in reality the Duke, though he at first affected to decline public business,<sup>6</sup> became the managing spirit. His imperious temper and decided views exercised a curious coercion upon the mind of his royal brother, whose disposition, naturally easy, had become still more indolent through advancing years.

Vos conseils et votre fermeté (wrote Louis XIV., February 18, 1682, in a striking letter of congratulation to the Duke of York on his impending return<sup>7</sup>) seront dorénavant très-néces-

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* (Rutland papers, ii. 65.)

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 249.

<sup>3</sup> We allude to the disastrous shipwreck of the *Gloucester* frigate in Yarmouth Road.

<sup>4</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 249.

<sup>5</sup> By August 5 Preston, in asking for a passport for Lady Hyde, then in France, describes her husband as 'first Minister of State to the King of England' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 329).

<sup>6</sup> *Dutch Despatches*.

<sup>7</sup> *Œuvres de Louis XIV.*, vi. 1.

1682 saires, pour fortifier le roi de la Grande-Bretagne dans la résolution de se servir des moyens que je lui offre d'affirmer la paix, et de rendre inébranlables les liaisons d'amitié auxquelles vous avez tant contribué. Le dit sieur Barillon vous instruira plus amplement de mes intentions.

Yet, despite the Duke's ascendancy, Lord Halifax remained a member of the interior or 'Cabinet' Council; and Charles himself, it is evident, continued to treat the Minister with an outward consideration which was generally held to betoken a real and even an affectionate partiality.

Your lordship (says Dryden<sup>1</sup>) held a principal place in his esteem, and perhaps the first in his affection, during his latter troubles . . . an exact knower of mankind and a perfect distinguisher of their talents . . . whatever his favourites of state might be, yet those of his affection were men of wit. . . . But in the latter part of his life . . . his secret thoughts were communicated but to few . . . who were *amici omnium horarum*, able to advise him in a serious consult . . . and afterwards capable of entertaining him with pleasant discourse. . . . He confined himself to a small number of bosom friends, amongst whom the world is much mistaken if your lordship was not first.

That Charles appreciated the agreeable qualities of his Minister and the personal deference which, transferred by others to his more energetic brother, Halifax, almost alone among the courtiers, still rendered to his Sovereign, is very probable. Lord Halifax himself, however, as is clear from the fourth section of the 'Character of Charles II.,' regarded the King's apparent kindness as a pure matter of policy, and knew that his own services were merely retained as a slight counterpoise to more aggressive factions whose violence inspired the shrewd though inert monarch with occasional alarm. The counsels of the Minister, indeed, now and then prevailed when some outstanding instance of the Duke's domineering temper had roused the tardy resentment of his brother;<sup>2</sup> and we shall presently give reason for our belief that at the death of Charles II. a very remarkable revolution in his favour was progressing.

<sup>1</sup> See Dryden's preface to *King Arthur*, first published in 1691 (*Prose Works*, edited by Malone, ii. 203).

<sup>2</sup> Halifax himself insinuates that while the Duke was supreme in the Cabinet, he was very familiarly used among the King's intimates (*Character of Charles II.*).

At the period of which we now treat,<sup>1</sup> however, the 1682 influence of Halifax was further reduced<sup>2</sup> by an event

<sup>1</sup> During this summer Lord Halifax was treated with peculiar severity by the lampoons of the period. We quote from the collection known as the *State Poems*:—

*The Impartial Trimmer*, 1682 (vol. i. part 1, pp. 166, 167).

‘Degenerate Rome and Spain deserves t’ outbrave us,  
If Hide or Hallifax can e’re enslave us.’

*A Satire in answer to a Friend*, 1682 (*ibid.* p. 129).

‘He that from Business would Preferment get . . .  
All Sense of Honour from his Breast must drive;  
And in a course of Villainies resolve to live . . .  
He must in his continu’d Greatness wait,  
With Guilt and Fears, th’ imprison’d Danby’s Fate.  
This Road has H — x and S — r gone,  
And thus must answer for the Ills they’ve done.’

*Satyr* (vol. iii. p. 127).

‘Where’er thou call’st, loud Scandal, will I fly  
From the proud State-man to the snivelling spy;  
From Hallifax, whose Crimes now furnish Fame . . .  
‘This man’, that he all Villains might exceed,  
His Honour sold for what he did not need.  
An Atheist once; now Popery has profess’d,  
Finding that suit with his good Morals best.  
He has sold his Country, and his King abus’d,  
Join’d with scorn’d Chits, he has Innocence accus’d,  
And is at last ev’n by those Chits refus’d.  
From Crime to Crime, he by degrees runs on,  
Not safe from one till he has a greater done.  
But he so false, and so condemn’d does grow,  
His fellow Rogues trust him no longer now.  
Yet use him still, and have found out a fit  
Employment for my Lord’s prodigious Wit.  
For join’d with Roger, he with like applause,  
Does write dull railing Libels for the Cause.  
But he so often lies to every Fool,  
That on that Theme his Son could scarce be dull.’

The allusion to Halifax as a pamphleteer no doubt refers to a series of hack pamphlets (maliciously attributed to Halifax in the retorting squibs) which appeared this summer, and of which an account will be found in the appendix to the *Works*. The concluding line refers to his eldest son, Lord Eland, a wit and a poetaster (*State Poems*, ii. 135):—

‘Ell — d whose Pen as nimbly glides,  
As his good Father changes Sides;  
His Head s with Thought as little vexd,  
Or taking care what shou’d come next.  
But he a Path much safer treads,  
Poets live when Statesmen lose their Heads,’ &c. &c.

(See also *ibid.* ii. 131.)

<sup>2</sup> On June 3 ~~Reyesby~~ warned Halifax against excessive frankness with untrustworthy colleagues. ‘He answered he knew it, but could not well avoid that freedom in business, but hoped his integrity would support him’ (*Memoirs*, p. 253).

1682 which caused him acute mortification. There was one person whose conduct at the Exclusion crisis had inspired him with an enduring resentment. His brother-in-law Sunderland, not content with betraying the policy which he had engaged to support, had never ceased to revile the friend who had stood to his guns,<sup>1</sup> and Halifax, though usually placable,<sup>2</sup> 'hated' him 'beyond expression.'<sup>3</sup> The disgraced Minister had long bitterly rued his ill-judged apostasy, and intrigued for a restoration to favour. His first application, addressed to the Duke, met with the coldness it deserved;<sup>4</sup> but with the Duchess of Portsmouth he was more successful. Charmed by the prospect of a Minister at her devotion she prevailed upon Charles to pardon his former secretary. Sunderland kissed hands on July 26,<sup>5</sup> with a tacit promise of preferment, and his brother-in-law was compelled to endure his fulsome advances.<sup>6</sup> The annoyance of Halifax may be imagined; but worse was to follow. On August 9, by royal command, Lord Anglesey resigned the Privy Seal.<sup>7</sup> With regard to a successor grave difficulties arose. Lord Halifax had never held office as the term is usually employed; his claims on the Government were, of course, transcendent; and indeed he had an actual promise of the first vacancy.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, Sir Edward Seymour—who, much to the chagrin of Halifax, had secured the support of Lord Hyde<sup>9</sup>—considered his own services equally meritorious;<sup>10</sup> and the importunity of the Duchess

<sup>1</sup> Reresby, January 5, 1682, mentions how Sunderland 'railed' against Halifax (*Memoirs*, p. 231).

<sup>2</sup> See *ante*, p. 325, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> Burnet, edit. 1833, ii. 338.

<sup>4</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 735, 736.

<sup>5</sup> Reresby erroneously supposed from this (he was then in the country) that the brothers-in-law were reconciled (*Memoirs*, p. 258).

<sup>6</sup> The *Dutch Despatches*, July 28, August 7 (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 293), describe how, in the Duchess of Portsmouth's apartment, Sunderland embraced Lord Halifax with professions of lasting friendship. Sunderland's letter to the Prince of Orange (Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. 559) is singularly mean in tone.

<sup>7</sup> The pretext was a publication reflecting on the memory (or construed as doing so) of Charles I. (Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 631). Carte insinuates that Anglesey was really removed because Halifax and Seymour coveted the place (*ibid.*). It appears, however, that Lord Anglesey was an Exclusionist. Some reflections on the state of the kingdom, written by him and remarkable for their good sense, will be found in the *Somers Tracts* and Cobbett's *Parl. Hist.*, vol. iv., appendix, p. clxxiv.

<sup>8</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 269. He derived his information from Halifax himself.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> He had been one of the few anti-Exclusionists in the Commons during the Parliament of 1680, and had taken a leading part in the debates.

of Portsmouth, with his undeniable departmental abilities, 1682 positively gave Lord Sunderland a certain advantage.<sup>1</sup> To prefer him, however, before Halifax or Seymour would have been too glaring an instance of political ingratitude, and the choice therefore lay between the two latter. It was generally believed that Seymour would prove the successful candidate, and that the Court would attempt to compensate Lord Halifax with a dukedom<sup>2</sup> and the Charter;<sup>3</sup> and the marquise actually conferred upon the Earl at this conjuncture<sup>4</sup> represents a move in this direction. Lord Halifax, however, declined to regard this accession of dignity which he had not desired as a satisfaction of his political claims;<sup>5</sup> the Privy Seal therefore remained two months in abeyance, from a hope that Lord Radnor, the President of the Council, might resign, and thus leave two vacancies at the disposal of the Government.<sup>6</sup> Eventually Seymour, recognising the hopelessness of his own candidature, retired into the country; on the evening of October 25 the Marquis of Halifax was declared Lord Privy Seal; and next day<sup>7</sup> he entered upon his duties.

The post was one which suited him to perfection. The precedence it conferred<sup>8</sup> was calculated to gratify a

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 356 (August 10), 497 (July 31).

<sup>2</sup> Carte insinuates that Halifax was believed to aim at a dukedom (*Life of Ormonde* iv. 640).

<sup>3</sup> Lauderdale's; it was actually given to the Duke of Hamilton.

<sup>4</sup> The patent is dated August 17. The preamble refers to the numerous, acceptable, and supremely important services rendered by Halifax to the Crown at moments of crisis. For a reported elevation of Seymour to an earldom, see *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 76.

<sup>5</sup> See Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 269, February 16; *infra*, p. 379. Halifax told him, 'The King commanding it, he would live fairly with Rochester, but he must give him some assurances of his being more his lordship's friend than my Lord Sunderland's, ere he could much confide in him.'

<sup>6</sup> Luttrell, September 20 (i. 221); *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv., part 4, p. 149 (September 23); *ibid.* vii. 480. An absurd rumour became current that Sir W. Coventry was about to accept the Great Seal (*ibid.* November 6).

<sup>7</sup> October 28. Sir Thomas Thynne wrote his congratulations from Longleat: 'though I foresee it will give me little advantage by Mr. Seymours neighbourhood;' (Seymour was at Maiden Bradley, between Longleat and Stourhead, where he lies buried) 'who (I guesse upon apprehension of what has happened :) has not repaied me ye visit I made him three weeks since. I am far from takeing for currant all ye money he payes me; and can easily separate his iust tears, from his resentments, but yet I cannot but say y<sup>e</sup> I have fears of my owne, for w<sup>ch</sup> I wish there were noe cause. I suppose L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland will bee ye next promoted, and then a Tory will make a desirable figure; whilst ye subside onely by ye mercy of ye French who have now all Europe in vassalage' (*Spencer MSS.*).

<sup>8</sup> See Clarendon, *Continuation of History*, ii. 21, 22. The order of precedence was as follows: The Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, President of the Council, Lord Privy Seal. But the Treasury was frequently in



1682 man who looked for place, not emolument. As regards relative importance, it ranked far higher than at present in the scale of Ministerial ambition, without exacting the severe application to the details of official routine, for which Halifax, we suspect, despite his business capacity, had little taste.

The elevation of Lord Halifax to the title of Marquis nearly coincided with the first marriage in his own family. On August 10, at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, 'Nan' Savile,<sup>1</sup> the only daughter of the first Lady Halifax and the darling of her grandmother Sunderland,<sup>2</sup> was married (as his second wife) to Lord Vaughan, eldest son of the Earl of Carbery.<sup>3</sup> The marriage created considerable political excitement.<sup>4</sup> Lord Vaughan, who in age must have been almost the contemporary of Lord Halifax, and concerning whom our scanty information suggests little that is prepossessing,

commission, and the Presidency as frequently in abeyance. In fact, the Presidency was regarded as, in practice, the inferior appointment; it was also worth less, the Privy Seal being valued at 3,000*l.* a year.

<sup>1</sup> A previous project of marriage in which the young lady's name had been involved is mentioned in a letter of Lord Halifax dated November 5, 1681, and addressed to Lord Norreys, afterwards first Earl of Abingdon, which is given on p. 225, vol. ii., of the *Catalogue of the Morrison Collection* (privately printed). The first part of the letter, referring to the affairs of Lord Eland, will appear in a subsequent part of this chapter. The writer proceeds as follows: "... The other kind part of your proposition, will I hope not taylor of our side if by your favour to mee and your influence upon your neighbour you can prevayle with him to like a gentlewoman not unmodestly bred, with 10,000*l.* and no debts with her, and one that if shee approveth of him enough to bee his, will I hope never dislike any way of living hee shall chuse, but perfectly conforme to his inclinations and circumstances. I have not told her of it nor shall, till I am encouraged from your Lordship to believe there may bee a further progresse in it."

<sup>2</sup> See Lady Sunderland's letters in Blencowe's *Sidney*.

<sup>3</sup> Born 1639 (Chester's *Westminster Abbey Registers*, as quoted in the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*); succeeded to the courtesy title on the death of an elder brother (Francis, first husband of the celebrated Lady Russell) March 7, 1667<sup>6</sup> (the note on p. 76, vol. i. of the *Halton Correspondence* confuses the brothers); served in France at the head of an English regiment, 1673; and went to Jamaica as Governor, 1674 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 7, pp. 104, 107, 108, 120, 163).

<sup>4</sup> Sir Charles Sidley to Lord Chesterfield, in *Letters of the Second Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 230. (See also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xii., part 5, p. 70.)

<sup>5</sup> Clarendon describes him in 1667 as a young man of as ill a face as fame; but, since Vaughan had taken an active part in his impeachment, he is not, perhaps, an unprejudiced witness. Pepys at that time (November 16, 1667) stigmatises Vaughan as extremely profligate. He is accused of violence in the execution of his duties as President of the Court of Wales (*Halton Correspondence*, i. 76), and when Governor of Jamaica (1675-76) was charged, with what justice we know not, of selling Englishmen as slaves (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 508). He possessed, however, literary tastes; ranks among Dryden's earliest patrons; and was President of the

had been an ardent Exclusionist. He seems to have 1682 ranked among the most active in voting Lord Halifax an enemy to his country, and we may presume that his alliance with the Saviles was the result of a desire to propitiate 'the powers that be.' His subsequent relations with the Marquis appear to have been very amicable.

Far more sturdiness of principles was shown meanwhile by another man, who while himself a tardy convert to the Exclusionist cause<sup>1</sup> had continued to maintain relations of the most intimate character with the heads of that discredited party. Lord Halifax had shown himself for more than a year peculiarly eager that his friend *Dr. Burnet* should declare for the Government.<sup>2</sup> He had introduced the Doctor at Court 'with a very extraordinary compliment,'<sup>3</sup> and had 'pressed' him 'vehemently' to accept of preferment, intimating that if the divine would give leave for the making of certain 'promises' in his name, the Marquis could obtain for him any post he might select. The reversion of the Mastership of the Temple seems to have been actually assured him; but the negotiation fell through because, according to Burnet's own account, he refused to forego the society of Lords Russell and Essex, and of Sir William Jones. The following letter tends to confirm these assertions:--

Royal Society, 1686-89 (Pepys, November 16, 1687, note). He died January 16, 1713, aged 84 (Chester, *Westminster Abbey Registers*, p. 275), with the reputation of great wealth, and an avarice which had withheld him from marrying his only daughter. It was reported that upon his death a servant, in answer to belated inquiries, responded that his master, he believed, was by this time half-way to hell (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 588). The match is obviously satirised in *State Poems* (ii. 128), where we meet with an allusion to a bridegroom who has recently married in his declining years:

Some say the Nuptial Knot was ty'd, t' unty  
The Mortgages which on his Land did lie;  
But my opinion is, they're in the wrong,  
He can't be just wh'as been a Knave so long;  
Tis like expecting Fish to live in Air,  
Or thee to leave the juice of Grapes for Beer.  
O Marquis, why didst match thy Blood so ill?  
Hadst thou in all things shew'd such want of Skill,  
Thou mightest e'en have stuck at Savil still.'

<sup>1</sup> It is clear that Burnet was one of those who, while at first inclined for 'Limitations,' ultimately adopted (no doubt, upon conviction) Exclusionist principles.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, edit. 1833, ii. 294-296, under date 1681.

<sup>3</sup> That he did not so much desire to put Burnet in the King's good opinion as the King in Burnet's good opinion, and that he hoped his Majesty would take the Doctor not only into his favour, but into his heart. During the ensuing conversation (for which, see p. 326, note 4, *ante*) Lord Halifax spoke of the King as head of the Church, and Charles made an enigmatical answer.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Dr. Burnet.*<sup>1</sup>

Oct. 16, 1682.

1682 Sir Though I was tender in advising you to wave any thing you might think advantageous for you, yet since you have thought fit to do it, I am at liberty to approve it: And I only desire you will not make too hasty resolutions concerning yourself, and not be carried so far by the sudden motions of a self-denying generosity, as to shut the door against those advantages, which you may expect with justice, and may receive without indecency. Only a little patience is requisite, and in the mean time no greater restraint upon your behaviour and conversation, than every prudent man, under your character and circumstances would chuse voluntarily to impose on himself. For what concerns me, or any part I might have, in endeavouring to serve you, I had rather you should hear it from any body, than from myself; and though you should never hear it from any body, I expect from your justice you should suppose it. Your withdrawing yourself from your old Friends, on this corrupted side of the Town, is that which I can neither approve for my own sake, nor for yours: For besides many other objections, such a total separation will make you by degrees think less equally, both of men and things, than you have hitherto professed to do, in what relates to the Publick. I have no jealousies of this kind for myself in particular, being resolved, at what distance soever, to deserve your believing me unalterably

Your faithful humble servant,

HALIFAX.

We must now return to topics of a more public nature, and sketch the progress of affairs, foreign and domestic—so far, at least, as they relate to Lord Halifax—under the new and more reactionary management. The Spanish Court still evinced a stubborn reluctance to accept the arbitration of the English King—a reluctance, as we are aware, admirably justified; since Charles himself, in a private intimation to the French Court, had originally suggested this arrangement, ‘in order that he might have an opportunity’ of assigning Luxembourg officially to France.<sup>2</sup> ‘It appeared,’ writes Halifax himself, some two years later,<sup>3</sup> ‘that notwithstanding [the King’s] merit towards the Confederates, in saving Luxembourg, the

<sup>1</sup> Printed from the original in Thomas Burnet’s *Life of his father*, prefixed to his *Works*, edit. 1753, p. xxxi; the spelling is evidently modernised.

<sup>2</sup> Dalrymple, part 1, book i., appendix, p. 98 (Barillon’s despatch of December 25, 1681).

<sup>3</sup> *Character of a Trimmer*.

remembrances of what had passed before, had left such an ill taste in their mouths, that they could not relish our being put into a condition to dispose of their interests.' <sup>1</sup> It was now therefore the turn of Spain to postpone the final answer by studied delays, hoping against hope meanwhile that, even at the last moment, a coalition against France might be effected, into which the force of public opinion in England might compel King Charles. The King of France responded to these procrastinating tactics by ostentatious military preparations. 'This Court,' wrote Lord Preston, successor of Henry Savile, June 1<sup>st</sup>, 'expresseth great inclinations to peace, but is preparing with great diligence for war.' <sup>2</sup> In answer Lord Halifax observes:

*The Earl of Halifax to Viscount Preston.*<sup>3</sup>

London, June 15 82.

My L<sup>d</sup> It is a welcome favour when ever your L<sup>d</sup>p lets mee hear from you, and it will bee more so, as often as you have occasion to give mee any of your commands, in the mean time, you impute much more to my endeavours of serving you, than I ought to claime, which layeth so much the greater obligation upon mee to deserve your acknowledgements in a greater degree than I can now pretend to.<sup>4</sup> Your L<sup>d</sup>p hath nothing to wish in your present imployment, but to bee known, for then, you are sure to bee esteemed. The Court of France doeth wisely to wish peace, and at the same time to prepare for warre, this method hath of late given them conquests without fighting, and except the rest of the world will resolve to take the example, they must knock under, and never pretend to contest. I will not take up more of your time when I have assured you of my being ever,

My L<sup>d</sup>,

Your most faithfull

Humble servant

HALIFAX.

<sup>1</sup> See also the *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* of July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1682. Spain thinks Charles 'too good a Frenchman.' On account of the uneasy condition of his internal affairs he is anxious to avert a war in any way, and therefore would be compelled to sacrifice everything to the pleasure of France, especially such places as involved no direct menace to the interests of England. On June 20, 1682, the Ambassadors confide to Lord Halifax their masters' desire of peace, alarm at French threats, and confidence in the pacific intentions of the Empire. They find him of a mind with them.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 265.

<sup>3</sup> Addressed 'Au Milord Preston Envoyé Extraordinaire d'Angleterre à Paris' (*Netherby MSS.*). A short abstract is given by *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 353.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. since his supersession by the Duke of York (?).

*The Marquis of Halifax to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

London Aug. 28. 82.

1682 My L<sup>d</sup>—It is in consideration of you, and because I would spare you, that I do not trouble your L<sup>d</sup>p so often with my thanks, as you give mee the occasion but I assure you I will never be wanting to your service, nor neglect any thing you shall at any time give mee commission to do in order to it; the last information<sup>2</sup> you sent over is considerable and your care in it is approved. Means will bee used to pursue the enquiry according to the hints that are given, and after all, if it should at last proove to be lesse materia<sup>l</sup> than it seemeth to bee at the first appearance, your L<sup>d</sup>p's part in it is such as must recommend you to his Ma<sup>ties</sup> good opinion. Wee are of your judgement here, that France doth not intend a warre, if they can get their pretensions yielded to them without it in which the likelihood of warre in Hungary giveth them great advantage, besides that they receive from the disioynte<sup>d</sup> condition of those princes and states whose interest it is to oppose them, what is lately done at Orange<sup>3</sup> either sheweth great anger to the prince or a mind to mortify him into more compliance. Our home affayres alwayes seeme calme in a long Vacation, but by Michaelmas terme, I suppose the noise and clamour against the Gov<sup>t</sup>. will bee revived. I am to thank your L<sup>d</sup>p for the prints you sent mee, and to shew you how I grow confident of your favour, I will desire you would by the first good opportunity, send mee a small parcell of french paper: this and all other liberties I shall take proceed from my being, very sincerely

My L<sup>d</sup>,

Your most faithfull

humble servant

HALIFAX.

The insolent interference of Louis with the Stadtholder's prerogative as Prince of Orange, to which the above letter refers, forms the subject of the next epistle:—

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>1</sup>

I do not know a stronger motive to make mee wish I had credit at Court than that I might serve your Highnesse with it.

<sup>1</sup> *Netherby MSS.* An imperfect abstract will be found in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 357.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning a French plot to seize Ireland (*ibid.* pp. 334, 335).

<sup>3</sup> Louis had interfered with the Prince's rights. (See d'Avaux, and *Dutch Despatches* [*Secrets*, August, and September<sup>12</sup>, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, pp. 178, 185.)

<sup>4</sup> Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. p. 553; no date. August or September, 1682 (?). (See the letter given above, and Groen van

not that I think upon the present occasion there is any need of 1682  
 it, the King being of himselfe so well disposed to do you all the  
 good offices in his power, though I dare not answer for the  
 successe of them, and your Highnesse will bee pleased not to  
 impute it to want of vigour in the instances that will bee made  
 in your behalfe, if they should not pre-vayle. Mr van Beu-  
 ninghen will give you an account what the french Embassadour  
 sayeth upon this occasion, but his present thoughts are not  
 concluding, and till an answer cometh from France, I would no  
 more give my opinion on the despayring side than I can in-  
 courage you to hope too much, because of the possibility there  
 is you may receive a disappointment. I have intermitted my  
 duty to your Highnesse for a longer time than I well know  
 how to justify, but the truth is I did not know what to say in  
 the present posture of things abroad, which have seemed to bee  
 a good while at a stand, in expectation of what would bee done  
 in Hungary, upon which very much dependeth; the last  
 account from thence giveth cause to beleve there will bee  
 warre with the Turks, which will probably dispose the French  
 to insist the more stiffely upon having their pretentions allowed  
 them<sup>1</sup>. I shall say nothing of our affayres at home; onely that,  
 if your Highnesse could bee here to see the advances made by  
 our publique spirited men<sup>2</sup> to get into the Court, you would bee  
 convinced of the truth of what I have told you concerning their  
 sincerity and good meaning, as fully as I hope you are of my  
 zeale to your service.

Spain eventually intimated a desire for the *mediation*  
 as opposed to the *arbitration* of the English King,<sup>3</sup> and  
 insisted that the proposed negotiations should include the  
 differences between the Empire and France as well as  
 those which concerned the Spanish Netherlands.<sup>4</sup> This  
 proposal, as the Spanish Court had foreseen, Louis refused  
 to entertain; and in effect he threatened a rupture unless  
 his terms should be accepted before the end of November.  
 In vain the Dutch representatives urged upon England  
 the reasonableness of the Spanish proposals, and sug-  
 gested a General Congress of the Powers; the English  
 Ministers, Lord Halifax included,<sup>5</sup> responded that under ex-  
 isting circumstances (the weakness of Spain, the divisions

Printed in *Archives*, 2nd series, vol. v. pp. 560-565; the most probable  
 date seems to be the middle of September (*ibid.* p. 563).

<sup>1</sup> Because of the incumbance the war must be to the Empire.

<sup>2</sup> He may refer to the means by which Sunderland was insinuating  
 himself into business. He was readmitted to the Privy Council about  
 September 20, and in October to the Committee.

<sup>3</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, <sup>September 26,</sup> 1682.  
<sup>October 16,</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, and *Character of a Trimmer*.

<sup>5</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol.  
 TTT, f. 260b.

1682 of Germany, the fears of Holland, and the dubious position of affairs in England<sup>1</sup> considered) Spain must accept the arbitrage in deference to the French ultimatum.

On <sup>October 27</sup>~~November 6~~ the Marquis had a long conversation with Van Beuning, and thus expressed himself 'with much kindness and confidence:—That the Ambassador was aware of the King's good inclinations, and did not ignore the present state of his affairs, and how much management they required, and had doubtless informed the States to that effect; but yet it should seem as if (were this well understood) the States would no longer be desirous to importune his Majesty with further instances (through his Excellency's memorials) in an affair which, considering the opposition of the King of France, could have no result. That a further answer was expected from Madrid on the subject of the arbitrage; and since the acceptance of the same would put a stop to further hostilities, it was to be trusted that the King of Spain, in the perplexed condition of his affairs, and of German affairs in general (on account of the severe contest with the Turks, which appeared to impend) would resolve to adopt that expedient. That this aspect of the question in especial should be presented to the king [of England]'s allies, avoiding all allusion to the impotence to which (as far as related to the affording them any effectual assistance) he was condemned by the state of his internal affairs, or to the painful necessity for a peaceable settlement as far as his Majesty is concerned, in order that he may succeed in attaining a position, in which he will be able to dispose of the resources of his kingdom; and that as regards both the French, and his Majesty's own discontented subjects, nothing but harm can result from any more positive instances on the subject, especially in writing.' The Marquis specially remonstrated concerning certain inquiries which had been made as to the action which in the last resort might be expected at the hands of the English King with regard to the maintenance of existing alliances. These inquiries Lord Halifax stigmatised as unprecedented and indecent, but insisted that in order to obtain the best results from the alliance and reciprocal friendship which ought to exist between England and

<sup>1</sup> Van Beuning himself confesses that the action of a problematic Parliament remains more than doubtful, and shrewdly observes how little the popular party really cared about foreign politics, and how prone it was to make use of foreign affairs as a mere instrument of domestic intrigue (*Despatches* [Secret]).

the States (and which necessitated an intimate confidence and an amicable interchange of views) a different policy must be pursued; and he urged the Ambassador, on the ground of his (the speaker's) sincere zeal for the interests of the States—'a zeal,' adds the Dutchman, 'of which I am entirely convinced'—to refrain from further representations,<sup>1</sup> which must compel the King to a formal resolution and a written response.

By November 8, meanwhile, Lord Preston wrote to Halifax that a breach between France and Spain appeared inevitable; but about the end of the month<sup>2</sup> Louis XIV. announced that at the instance of the English King he had decided to leave the question of arbitration open until January 15.

Four days later Lord Halifax wrote as follows to Lord Preston:—

*The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Preston.*<sup>3</sup>

London Dec: 4. 82. .

My L<sup>d</sup>,—I am to acknowledge your favour to mee,<sup>4</sup> and to assure you, that I should take the more pleasure in the station I am in,<sup>5</sup> if it might give mee better opportunities of serving your L<sup>d</sup>p and therefore when ever you can think mee of use to you, your directions shall find mee very well prepared to observe them; the prolongation of the terme lately obtained from France by our Master,<sup>6</sup> is the likeliest means to keep the world in peace, but it is not yet known how it will work in Spayne and Holland, where there is at the same time a fear of a warre, and yet a great Slownesse to use the most probable methods to prevent it. a little more time must needs open the scene and the world will at least bee put out of the suspence it is now in for the event of things, the Spring being so criticall a time, that wee shall bee able then to guesse, what the weather will bee for the rest of the year. Your L<sup>d</sup>p hath a difficult province enough, which I am not sorry for, because you will have so much the more credit, by acquitting your selfe so well, as I am sure you will do, and as often as there shall bee occasion of doing you right here, you may depend upon it, from,

My L<sup>d</sup>,

Your most faithfull

humble servant

HALIFAX.

<sup>1</sup> Hyde meanwhile, though aware how just were such reproaches, took a tone of exasperation, and complained that the States suspected Charles.

<sup>2</sup> Barillon made the announcement on November 30 (Dutch Despatches [Secret], British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 303).  
December 10

<sup>3</sup> Addressed 'Au, Milord, Milord Preston Envoyé extraordinaire d'Angleterre, à Paris' (Netherby MSS.); an abstract is given in *Ist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 360.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 273 (November 7<sup>th</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> Lord Preston had paid his compliments to the new Lord Privy Seal.



1682 The Spanish Crown, however, persisted in refusing arbitration, and in pressing for a *mediatory* intervention on the part of Charles. Upon this the English King responded that Spain, having rejected his arbitration, must settle her own affairs.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Preston.*<sup>1</sup>

London Dec: 26. 82.

My L<sup>d</sup> - It seemeth the Ministers of Spayne now in Paris were rightly informed of the intentions of their own Court, when they expressed such an aversion to the Arbitrage,<sup>2</sup> for by what wee hear from Madrid, as well as by their extraordinary proceeding towards S<sup>r</sup> Harry Goodrick,<sup>3</sup> it appeareth they are resolved not to agree to it, and yet at the same time are sufficiently apprehensive of the ill consequences a warre may bring upon them. And now they would sayne put it upon the King my master (to whom it least belongeth) to find out some other expedient after they have reiected that which hee offered them.<sup>4</sup> I read your letter to his Ma<sup>ty</sup> who very well approoveth your L<sup>ds</sup> answer to the proposall made to you of calling a Parliament.<sup>5</sup> Hee resolveth to keep that intirely in his own power, and to chuse his own time, without consulting either any forreigne princes or their Ministers in a thing of which hee conceaveth him selfe to bee much a more proper judge than they can pretend to bee: and as for the Kings asking a farther delay from the K. of France, hee is not satisfied it would bee of much use, and therefore I beleeve will be very slow in doing any

<sup>1</sup> *Netherby MSS.* (an abstract of it will be found in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 361). This letter is a reply to Preston's of December 13 (ibid. p. 276), which is in itself an answer to the letter written by Halifax, December 4. (See *ante* p. 369.)

<sup>2</sup> '... the ministers of Spain, of which there are now three in this Court ... seem still to be averse from accepting the arbitrage of our master' (Preston's letter, as above).

<sup>3</sup> English representative at Madrid. A difference had arisen between him and that Court on the subject of privilege; he had been forbidden the Court; and at this moment, when the friendship of England appeared of such paramount importance, Spain was agitating for his recall. Eventually he was expelled from Madrid (*Dutch Despatches: Secret*), October 2, 1682; November 30, 1682; and December 22, 1682. British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT).

<sup>4</sup> 'One of those ministers told me the other day that he could wish with all his heart that the King my master would find out a temperance for the composing of those differences' (Preston's letter, as above).

<sup>5</sup> The Spanish Minister had told Preston 'he believed that if the King would call a Parliament it would put him into a better condition to bring [the French] King to reason, whose custom it is to observe no Treaties longer than they appear to be for his advantage, unless he be forced to it. . . .' Preston had answered 'that his Majesty was in very good circumstances and in a capacity to undertake the arbitrage, and also so; that what was concluded should be observed: that I believed he would not be pleased that any one should prescribe to him the time of calling his Parliament, that he would do it when his affairs required it, and not before' (ibid.).

thing of that kind, except hee should have more reason to hope 1682-83  
than hee hath had yet, that in case it was granted, it might  
produce a good effect. I am to congratulate the satisfaction  
your L<sup>d</sup> will have, when all your family is together, after your  
having been so long divided from it and wish you happinesse in  
all other kinds, being,

My L<sup>d</sup>, Your most faithfull

humble servant,

HALIFAX.

For months these diplomatic altercations continued, since the King of France was not in point of fact anxious for war, so long as a possibility remained of obtaining his objects by menace and unscrupulous diplomacy. The English Ministers, including Lord Halifax, persistently maintained that since the arbitrage had been rejected the English King could interfere no further, without fresh overtures from the Allies.<sup>1</sup> On May 1<sup>st</sup>, 1683, Lord Sunderland, in answer to some fresh appeal, rather rudely retorted that England had nothing to propose, excepting the arbitrage; that she would take no steps until affairs in Germany had a more settled appearance; and that the fears expressed in relation to France seemed excessive, since that Power did not appear to desire a war.

Speaking afterwards to the Marquis of Halifax on the subject (says the Dutch representative), he gave me to understand much the same, pretty plainly, in language very similar, though more polite. And among other things, he suggested whether (since it was obvious, that there was here no desire to give a definite answer) it were any use making applications of this nature, and continuing to insist upon them; and whether it would not be better to temporise, than to expose ourselves to a decided refusal; and meanwhile to try and assure ourselves of the summer, which he thought would not be very (difficult);<sup>2</sup> if done discreetly, and as it were *par forme d'acquit*, at a favourable opportunity, more calculated to further our task (?).

The Dutchman hereupon recapitulated the apprehensions which the action of France inspired; the Marquis, we are told, 'was pleased with a friendly countenance,

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 1683. Differences were rife at this period between England and Holland in the East Indies. Charles was reported to have said that at present he had no eyes, but that, unless satisfaction should be given, he should prove himself to have not only eyes but feet. The Dutchmen attached the more importance to this rumour because almost the same expression had fallen from the Marquis of Halifax, April 21.  
May 1.

<sup>2</sup> Meaning obscure.

1682-83 and a pressure of the hand, to whisper in my ear, "Monsieur, prends garde à ce que je vous dis, tout ira bien"—a compliment which but confirmed the Dutchman in his belief that the Court merely desired to evade an immediate answer, and thus to gain time.

But while Lord Halifax perceived the hopelessness of encouraging the Spanish Court in a resistance which at this conjuncture could only prove futile, while in his official character he was compelled to endorse a policy which he was impotent to traverse, his inherent patriotism revolted, with a really passionate sense of injury, from the spectacle presented at the moment upon the European stage. In the 'Character of a Trimmer,' written some eighteen months later, the insolent superiority of France is stigmatised with an almost tragic force, while the feeble dependent attitude of the English Court becomes an occasion for the bitterest and most contemptuous satire, not unmingled with a characteristic infusion of sardonic innuendo:—

Our great earnestness also to persuade the Confederates to consent to [the arbitration] was so unusual and so suspicious a method, that it might naturally make them believe, that France spake to them by our mouth . . . and so little care hath been taken to cure this, or other jealousies the Confederates may have entertained, that quite contrary, their Ministers here every day take fresh alarms from what they observe in small, as well as in greater circumstances. . . . Thus we now stand, far from being innocent spectators of our neighbour's ruin, and by a fatal mistake, forgetting what a certain fore-runner it is to our own. . . . It is not partiality (the Minister assures us) which moveth him; but the just fear, which all reasonable men must have of an overgrown power . . . he hath no such peevish obstinacy as to reject all correspondence with France, because we ought to be apprehensive of the too great power of it. He would not have the King's friendship to the Confederates extended to the involving him in any unreasonable or dangerous engagements; neither would he have him lay aside the consideration of his better establishment at home, out of his excessive zeal to serve his allies abroad; but sure there might be a mean between these two opposite extremes; and it may be wished that our friendship with France should at least be so bounded, that it may consist with the honour as well as the interest of England. . . . When England might ride Admiral at the head of the Confederates, to look like the 'Kitchen Yacht' to the 'Grand Louis' is but a scurvy figure for us to make in the map of Christendom.

And the Marquis proceeds to lament with pathetic

energy 'that the life and vigour which should move us against our enemies, is miserably applied to tear our own bowels;' that 'by a fatality which seemeth peculiar to us' we 'misplace our active rage one against the other whilst we are turned into statues on that side where lieth our greatest danger.'<sup>1</sup> 1682-83

Nor were these denunciations equivalent to a mere criticism after the event. The anti-Gallican sympathies of Halifax were notorious all through the period in question; and while in his professedly official correspondence his sentiments were, of course, shrouded by the decent mantle of Ministerial reserve, their outspoken expression lends a peculiar interest to the more individual intercourse between the Marquis and Lord Preston. That nobleman had been originally in the service of the Duke of York, to whom doubtless he owed his appointment at the Court of Versailles. But the post, as in the case of Henry Savile, exerted upon the mind of the Envoy a very salutary influence by stimulating a perhaps dormant patriotism; and his want of pliability soon rendered Lord Preston obnoxious to the authorities at Versailles.<sup>2</sup> From the home Government he received little support, and our representative soon discovered that Lord Halifax alone among the Ministers endorsed his national aspirations. Letters, however, if transmitted by the ordinary post, were not safe from official inspection on either side the water;<sup>3</sup> and the two could only communicate, with any approach to freedom, through occasional channels.

By March 24, 1682, the refusal of leave of absence, on which the Envoy had counted for an opportunity of consulting Lord Halifax,<sup>4</sup> drove Preston to the hazardous expedient of sending a confidential letter by post, though *under cover*.<sup>5</sup> He warned the Lord Privy Seal that a French emissary<sup>6</sup> was starting for England with, as he believed, private instructions, and proceeded to suggest --

<sup>1</sup> The whole passage from which these few extracts are taken is well worth reading.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 338 (September 7, 1682).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 280 (February 3, 1683 [s.n.]), Preston to Halifax. As he has reason to suspect their letters are sometimes opened, he suggests the employment of a cypher.

<sup>4</sup> He had asked the assistance of the Lord Privy Seal in obtaining it (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 340, 341): 'I guess,' he writes, 'from whence this [refusal] proceeds.'

<sup>5</sup> Letter-book, *Spencer MSS.* 31 (11); *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 341a.

<sup>6</sup> M. le Grand Prieur. He was ostensibly in disgrace, but Preston believed he had orders to discuss public affairs in secret with the Duchess of Portsmouth.

1692-83

I have some reason to believe that they are not designed either in favour of your lordship or of Mr. Secretary Jenkins; you have both the misfortune not to be too much in the good graces of this Court . . . it can do your lordship no harm to be upon your guard, and to keep your eyes open for a while, and I hope your lordship will endeavour to keep your ground for the good of England, tho' it be to your own loss. I am a stranger to many things which pass in England at present, but I am very well satisfied of your lordship's care of us all, and I wish your designs success. If this reacheth you I hope your lordship will let it pass no farther.<sup>1</sup>

Eight months later, this time by a private hand, the Envoy transmitted to Lord Halifax that extraordinary confidential despatch which occupies two and a half of the closely printed folio pages, arranged with double columns, which were formerly affected by the Historical Manuscripts Commission.<sup>2</sup> 'I should oftener,' he observes, 'impart things which are observable and of consequence to be remarked here if I had not found that advices of this kind are not agreeable at home, and that I have suffered by sometimes giving of them; so that I may freely say to your lordship, I am often more solicitous what to suppress than what to write, therefore nothing but your lordship's commands (to whom I have so many obligations) could have drawn from me at this time some things which will make the subject of this letter.' Upon this exordium there follows an elaborate indictment of the policy of France, as shown in her relations with foreign States. The Envoy dwells upon the continued encroachments in Flanders, which, he adds, were long since foretold by Halifax himself; upon the just determination of Spain to avoid an arbitrage which, by involving the loss of Luxembourg, might enable Louis to terrorise the German Electorate, and become, in course of time, Emperor of the West. Lord Preston further insists upon the unscrupulous fashion in which France intrigued for the dissolution of whatever Government or coalition dared withstand her, and upon her determination to obtain by threats or stratagem what her exhausted finances rendered her averse from attempting by force of arms. He points

<sup>1</sup> Preston obtained leave between April 24 and June 23. But the correspondence is resumed in a letter of August 14, in which Preston, while thanking Halifax for cautions received prior to departure, adds: 'I have been thus long silent because I have not had the opportunity of such an hand as I liked of conveying a letter to your lordship' (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 341a).

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 341-346 (October 5 [s.n.], 1683).

out that while France obviously maintained relations with Whig or Exclusionist circles in England (relations upon which Preston, by the way, lays absurdly exaggerated stress), the Envoy is yet tormented by reports of an understanding, and even of a league offensive and defensive, between Charles and Louis, of which M. Barillon was the supposed channel – a suspicion of which we have long gauged the absolute accuracy. 1682-83

I find (so Lord Preston concludes <sup>1</sup>) that your lordship lies still under the same misfortune of being no favourite to this Court; and Mons<sup>r</sup> Barillon dare not do you the honour to shine upon you, since his master frowneth. They know very well your lordship's qualifications, which make them fear, and consequently hate you. And be assured, my lord, if all their strength can send you to Rufford it shall be employed for that end. Two things I hear they particularly object against you, your secrecy and your being incapable of being corrupted. Against these two things I know they have declared. My Lord Sunderland's being for them they openly avow.<sup>2</sup>

We must now inquire what conduct was pursued by Lord Halifax in relation to domestic affairs from March 1682 until the middle of 1683. In this, as in the former province, his influence was extremely attenuated. The return of the Duke of York had marked the entire abandonment of that conciliatory policy for which Halifax had striven. It had given a natural impulse to those High Prerogative or 'Tory' sentiments of which the Duke was the most consistent exponent, had exaggerated the rebound from 'Whig' or Exclusionist principles, and had exasperated the bitterness of party hatreds, which were already sufficiently acute.

• The year 1682 was marked by a determined and successful attempt, on the part of the Government, to break the power of the 'Whigs' in their principal stronghold – the municipalities. 'Tory' sheriffs were foisted upon the City; and this step, by giving the Court entire control over the selection of juries in the metropolis, excited to madness the terrors of the defeated Whigs, and gave the first impetus to that network of secret intrigue comprehensively known to history as the 'Rye House Plot.'

In these manipulations Lord Halifax does not appear to

<sup>1</sup> This passage has been printed by Macaulay as a note to the second chapter of his history.

<sup>2</sup> Other letters from Preston to Lord Halifax will be found in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 344a and 344b, October <sup>6</sup>/<sub>10</sub>, 1683; February <sup>9</sup>/<sub>10</sub>, 16<sup>83</sup><sub>84</sub>; and Dalrymple, part i., book i., p. 138, October <sup>26</sup>/<sub>27</sub>, November <sup>3</sup>/<sub>5</sub>, 1683.

16<sup>th</sup> century have taken a conspicuous part.<sup>1</sup> His name occurs, indeed, occasionally in contemporary lampoons<sup>2</sup> as a Ministerial instigator, but upon questions of responsibility such publications seldom discriminate. A pamphlet of the day ascribes to Halifax the epigram 'That he foresaw there would be hanging, and was resolved to hang last ;'<sup>3</sup> but while the form of the saying appears sufficiently characteristic, the authority is decidedly unreliable.

The control of juries, however, constituted but one among the objects of the Government campaign. It was regarded as an essential corollary that the municipal corporations of the kingdom should be so remodelled as to exclude the 'Whigs' both from municipal influence, and from the exercise of the Parliamentary franchise in boroughs. Upon pretences of the most transparent triviality the validity of the City Charter - that is, of the entire franchises possessed by the Corporation of London - was called into Court ; and, thanks to the subserviency of a Judicial Bench holding office 'during pleasure,' these proceedings culminated about the close of 1683 in a forfeiture of the privileges in question. Similar actions, or the fear of them, soon brought a large proportion of the provincial municipalities to a dependence on the Court.

It was upon Lord Halifax that his enemies, at a later date, attempted to foist the stigma of this policy. The endeavour in itself proves nothing, since the same effort was made in cases where the innocence of the Lord Privy Seal can be demonstrated. Nor do we find that malice itself could adduce any evidence upon this point, save the vague report of a private conversation to which Lord Halifax alludes with a contempt which was not, we fancy, undeserved.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand,

<sup>1</sup> The Duke of Ormonde and Jenkins were the most active agents.

<sup>2</sup> *State Poems*, iv. 336, where Sir John Moor, the Mayor, a Court tool, is described as meditating :

'Absent from J       s, H       x and all  
That in his Ears for ever buz and bawl ;'

while on p. 340, in reference to an episode during which the sheriffs who had contravened the action of the Lord Mayor were temporarily confined to the Tower, we learn that :

'Four small Devils did hoist 'em on their backs ;  
Behold the Policy of Hallifax :  
Who makes the Protestants Devotion thus,  
From Hell, and Hull, and Him, deliver us.'

<sup>3</sup> *The Rights of the City further Unfolded*, 1682, p. 4 - a contemporary pamphlet quoted in this connection by Ralph, i. 691.

<sup>4</sup> See the proceedings of the 'Murder' Committee in 1689.

there is some reason to believe that the campaign, though it did not originate with Lord Halifax, had at least his tacit sanction. In the 'Character of a Trimmer,' where the Marquis censures with as much freedom as skill the errors which he perceived in the Administration, these proceedings are never mentioned, and the omission is the more noticeable because the majority of the new charters perforce passed his office.<sup>1</sup> The surrender of the Nottingham Charter was made into the hands of the King, Lord Halifax, and Secretary Jenkins: while Halifax and Secretary Jenkins appear to have been charged with the task of drafting a new one.<sup>2</sup> 1682

Again, about November or December 1682, the Whig magnates of York, anxious to conciliate the Court by any measure short of surrendering their charter, suggested to Sir John Reresby (then Governor of York) a *modus vivendi*. They proposed, on receipt of a Royal intimation, to elect, out of due course, a Tory Lord Mayor: to replace Buckingham, their High Steward, by the Duke of York, or, in default of him, by Lord Halifax; and to return Tory members at the next General Election. On December 20 Reresby received an answer from the Marquis: -

... he gave me (says Reresby<sup>3</sup>) his thoughts that though he approved the laying Alderman Thompson aside from being lord mayor (as had been proposed), yet he thought it not safe to venture the King's letter upon it to the corporation, except the success was absolutely certain; and the rather because affairs went so well above (especially that of the *quo warranto* against the City charter), that all other corporations would truckle; and should the King's letter not be considered, it would rebound in the face of the Court, and be an encouragement to that party. As to the second, which was the choosing his highness for their lord steward, he did judge it unfit for him upon several accounts: but for himself (if it were so done as that it should not seem to be desired by his lordship, and that it appeared, should the thing miscarry, that he had a considerable number of friends for him therein,) he was content

<sup>1</sup> Sixty-six of these charters passed the Seal in his time (*Lords' Journal*, xiv. 394).

<sup>2</sup> See the account in Ralph, i. 682, 683, quoting from the Somers Tracts a protest of the Nottingham burgesses. (See also *Dulch Despatches* [Open], August 18, November 17, 1682, and February 19, 1683, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, ff. 305b, 359b, 401.) The surrender seems to have been obtained by extremely sharp practice on the part of the mayor, to say the least, but there is nothing to connect Halifax with this part of the affair.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 265.



1682-83 to attempt it,<sup>1</sup> and would put himself and the management to me; using this compliment, that he knew himself to be in very good hands.<sup>2</sup>

This evidence is less conclusive than it appears, at first sight. The force of the allusion to the municipal charters depends on the exact form of the expressions employed, which, as given above, may represent a mere gloss on Reresby's part; while the real interest of Lord Halifax obviously centres upon his desire that he, rather than the Duke of York, should obtain so public a mark of confidence as the proposed election would imply. On the other hand, we observe this correspondence is not the only one in which the Minister's approval of the policy under discussion is taken for granted;<sup>3</sup> while it is certain that the Marquis accepted a seat on the Commission appointed, upon the collapse of the City franchises, to supervise the reform of the magistracy.<sup>4</sup>

"On the whole, therefore, we conclude that Lord Halifax must share the obloquy which these proceedings have brought upon the Administration of which he was a member. The charge is a serious one, since it is obvious that the attacks on the independence of the municipalities constituted one of the most serious shocks to the principle of self-government which have ever interrupted the course of our political development." The policy is, of course, perfectly compatible with the known views of the Duke of York and his followers; but that Lord Halifax should have ignored, for the sake of a momentary advantage to the cause of order, so serious a constitutional danger is indeed surprising. The best excuse which can be made for him—and a lame one at best, it is—lies in the belief he probably entertained that these regulations would render

<sup>1</sup> Eventually Halifax declined the honour out of consideration for Buckingham, who had made overtures to the Court (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 351 [March 22]), and with whom Reresby represents Halifax as on friendly terms. It was bestowed on a son of the Duchess of Portsmouth (Reresby, *Apri* 11).

<sup>2</sup> Halifax had considerable confidence in Reresby. He had gratified him by observing in respect of some attempts at mischief-making that 'he must ever make a difference of men by his own trial, and not by the opinions they had of themselves' (May 12, 1684, p. 250).

<sup>3</sup> See letters from the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Halifax (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [34]) early in 1684.

<sup>4</sup> See Luttrell, i. 295, January 15, 1684. He describes the Commission as one to 'supervise all things concerning the city, and turn out those persons in hospitals and other public places who are whiggishly inclined.'

<sup>5</sup> See the very remarkable passage at p. 5 in the *Memoirs* of Lord Lonsdale, a connection of Lord Halifax.

the King less averse to a speedy session of Parliament,<sup>1</sup> 1682-83 and conduce, by effacing the more violent Exclusionists, to national union. The opinion was not altogether unfounded, but the price to be paid for these advantages appears extravagant in the extreme.

The steps of this affair have led us to anticipate; and resuming the consideration of events in their chronological order, we must now recur to the spring of 1683, which brought to Lord Halifax two severe political mortifications. About the end of January<sup>2</sup> the Seals fell to the disposal of the Government; they were bestowed upon Lord Sunderland, who some three months earlier had been admitted to the 'Cabinet' Council,<sup>3</sup> and Halifax bitterly remarked to Reresby<sup>4</sup> that the Duke of York 'now seemed kinder to that lord—who had done all he could against him in the late Parliaments—than to his lordship, who did<sup>5</sup> all he could to serve him.' He confessed to 'other disappointments of the same kind from that quarter;' and Reresby even gives us to understand that the faction of the Duke had made a vigorous, though unsuccessful, attempt to drive Halifax from office.<sup>6</sup>

A few weeks later and the Duke himself was openly readmitted to the deliberations of the Privy Council,<sup>7</sup> an event which naturally increased his already overweening preponderance.

It would appear that Lord Halifax ascribed the reconciliation between the Duke of York and Lord Sunderland to the influence of Hyde, newly created Earl of Rochester. The circumstance naturally inflamed an affair<sup>8</sup> which does not appear to have originated in personal animosity, but during the progress of which the antipathy between Halifax and the extreme Tories issued in an open breach. In the nation at large the incident to which we are about to refer excited great attention.

<sup>1</sup> The *Dutch Despatches* of 1681-82 frequently express the opinion that the Court is deterring a session till the City Charter has been quashed, &c.

<sup>2</sup> January 29-31.

<sup>3</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Open)*, November 1<sup>st</sup>, vol. FF, f. 351.

<sup>4</sup> Reresby, p. 269, February 9.

<sup>5</sup> I.e. had done.

<sup>6</sup> 'For all this he was very well with the King. It was not in their power to remove him, though all the other interest engaged against him' (Reresby, p. 269). The *Hatton Correspondence* (ii. 21) shows that at this date only the Duke of York, Ormonde, Halifax, and the Secretaries were admitted into the Bedchamber 'without leave first asked.'

<sup>7</sup> *Life of James II.*, i. 738.

<sup>8</sup> *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*. February 20, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 326; Macpherson, i. 137, 138; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 362; Burnet; North's *Lives of the Norths* (Jessopp), ii. 202-204.

1682 and gained for the Marquis himself a high reputation among men of patriotism and moderation; and we shall therefore describe it with a fulness which might otherwise appear disproportionate. We gather that some year or two earlier the Treasury, in a moment of pressure, had borrowed from the farmers of the Chimney tax, who, in repayment of the loan, were allowed to farm a certain portion of that tax upon special terms.<sup>1</sup> These advantages, in consequence of fraudulent representations on the part of these farmers (or, as they were usually termed, Commissioners) of the Hearth-money, were grossly disproportionate, and early in 1682 a man named Shales, one of the Commission, pointed out that the arrangement involved immense loss to the revenue. He first applied to Rochester, and offered to undertake the farm at an advance which is variously estimated at 20,000*l.*, 30,000*l.*, and 50,000*l.* Rochester dismissed the suggestion; and Shales then carried his complaints and suggestions to the Lord Privy Seal.<sup>2</sup> Halifax, under the impression—which seems to have been correct<sup>3</sup> that Rochester was the victim rather than the accomplice of the farmers, urged that lord to investigate the matter. Rochester, however, who was notorious for a passionate temper, resented this interference with a violence which begot the most sinister interpretations in the minds of all concerned, the Marquis included. He opened the matter in Council,<sup>4</sup> and declared ‘that the farmers ought to be exchequered; and their farm, as a deceit of the King, laid aside; and they, as managers,<sup>5</sup> to become accountants and, having allowance for their pains and charges, the surplus to be answered to the King.’ The Treasury defended the farmers, and the question<sup>7</sup> seemed decided in their favour. The fury of Rochester, however, was not appeased by success; he roundly asserted that Halifax accused him of

<sup>1</sup> The *Dutch Despatches* (*Secret*) <sup>February 20</sup> say the farmers had <sup>March 2</sup> promised 120,000*l.* a year. They were to receive 16,000*l.* a year, and give the surplus to the King. In reality, however, at the end of the five years they had made a secret profit of 60,000*l.* on the surplus, of which the King only received 17,000*l.*

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, ii. 339.

<sup>3</sup> See Dudley North’s opinion.

<sup>4</sup> Apparently about <sup>January 23</sup> <sup>February 2</sup> (Dutch Despatches [*Open*], British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 394b).

<sup>5</sup> North, ii. 202.

<sup>6</sup> *Farmers*, who paid a fixed sum, were contrasted, in seventeenth-century finance, with *managers*, accountable to the King for the entire receipts. (See Carte’s *Ormonde*, iv. 642)

<sup>7</sup> *Dutch Despatches* (*Open*).

corruption, and 'would neither see, hear, nor endure any- 1683  
thing or person that was not clear on his side.'

On January 31, 1683, Sir Thomas Thynne, who had been recently<sup>2</sup> raised to the Peccage as Viscount Weymouth, touches upon the current dispute in terms of some anxiety, 'for though' (as he tells the Marquis<sup>3</sup>) 'I am satisfied y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>n</sup> would not begin any thing of that nature, without beeing very well grounded, yet I am not sure it will prevails where interest and great friends take ye other side. y<sup>n</sup> designe was iust and honorable and what y<sup>n</sup> oath requireth, and as such y<sup>e</sup> countrey esteeme it, whom you have entirely for y<sup>n</sup>, but how little support y<sup>t</sup> yeilds, y<sup>n</sup> best knowe.'

Lord Halifax, however, appears to have been more hopeful. A fortnight later<sup>4</sup> he told Sir John Reresby<sup>5</sup> 'That he would keep in his corner, and bear what was offered for the King's service, and not be afraid to declare what he heard to his Majesty's disadvantage, whoever was concerned in it; and whenever he had power, he would distinguish between his<sup>6</sup> friends and those that were not so.' He persisted in his endeavours, and the question was soon reopened.

On February 19<sup>7</sup> 'the fraud . . . came to be argued by counsel on both sides before the King.' It is difficult to understand the exact nature and the precise result of the inquiry. Reresby contends that the charge was proved, others<sup>8</sup> maintain that Shales (the informant) had failed to establish his contention, and that the Treasury had scored a great triumph. On the whole, we are inclined to conclude (a) that Shales, in the opinion of such persons as were not biassed in favour of the incriminated officials, had proved his assertion by the testimony of independent evidence; (b) that his statements did not tally with the books of the Commissioners; (c) that Lord Rochester refused to admit the possibility of falsifications and the consequent necessity for a further investigation, and that his interest, as the head of the

<sup>1</sup> North, ii. 202.

<sup>2</sup> October 1682.

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (24).

<sup>4</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 269, February 16.

<sup>5</sup> Whom he had informed of 'all the steps of the affair.' It is, therefore, interesting to find that Reresby seems to have suspected Rochester of fraud, and that he assessed the King's loss at 40,000*l.* (p. 268). So also *Dutch Despatches (Secret)* of <sup>February 20,</sup> <sup>March 2</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> The King's (?). <sup>7</sup> Reresby, p. 269; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 362.

<sup>8</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 362; *Dutch Despatches (Secret)*, <sup>February 20,</sup> <sup>March 2</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. TTT, f. 385 (by report; the sitting of the Council was with closed doors).

16<sup>83</sup> Treasury Commission, prevailed; (*d*) that under these circumstances the legal authorities pronounced the former contract valid, and decided that it could not be annulled in favour of the new tender; and that (*e*) Lord Halifax in consequence pressed the matter no farther.<sup>1</sup>

The triumph of the Rochester faction was not, however, complete; 'whereas some of that lord's friends did reflect upon my Lord Halifax, as too busy in making that discovery, the King justified him so far as to say of him openly that day in Court, upon the trial, that his lordship had done nothing in that affair but by his order and approbation.'<sup>2</sup>

The comments which the business excited may be gathered from the following extracts:—

*Viscount Weymouth to the Marquis of Halifax.*<sup>3</sup>

L. Leat. Febr. y<sup>e</sup> 25<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>3</sup>.

My dearest Lord— . . . common newse letters . . . of this last weeke concerne cheifly y<sup>r</sup> selfe, and L<sup>d</sup> Roc. they speake of a long hearing before ye Kg. on Monday where Mr Wallop,<sup>1</sup> Maynard<sup>1</sup> and Polexfen<sup>1</sup> appeared as Counsell for y<sup>r</sup> selfe and Capt. Shales, when it was proved y<sup>t</sup> severall thousand pounds were lent [<sup>2</sup>] by ye officers of ye Treasury, and y<sup>e</sup> each Com<sup>r</sup> had a 1000<sup>l</sup> and ye overplus privately applied to his Maties servise but not mentioned in ye contract to avoide ye censure of ye H. of Commons, for lending money upon Anticipations these seeme great points, but being soe much in ye darke, presume not to give any opinion, but certainly the discoverer of this has done the Kg an acceptable servise, and highly merits his support and favour, that w<sup>ch</sup> most stumbles me, is y<sup>t</sup> ye Kgs chief Counsell, ye Attorney and Sollicitor were not engaged in the defense of soe advantageous a proposition for the increase of his revenue, but rather those who are esteemed less inclinable to the Court interest— unlesse ye points were too high for them to bee willing to open, especially considering the relation one hath to a Com<sup>r</sup>. I am sure y<sup>r</sup> Lp. has attempted an honest and generous Action, w<sup>ch</sup> will beare y<sup>u</sup> out, whatever ye succe<sup>s</sup>e is, though Rubicon being past, there is noe retreat, nor appearance of reconciliation between you two; w<sup>ch</sup> some time since I heard ye Kg intended to make.

I suppose y<sup>r</sup> Lp. though noe greate admirer of ye sport, will

<sup>1</sup> Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 138 (from the Duke's *Memoirs*). 'So great,' says Reresby, 'was my Lord Rochester's interest (being supported by the Duke of York, my Lady Portsmouth, and my Lord Sunderland) that little notice was taken' of Halifax's contention 'for that time' (p. 270).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (24).

<sup>1</sup> Eminent Whigs.

<sup>2</sup> The lawyers mentioned as counsel for Halifax and Shales were all, as previously intimated, well-known Whigs.

hee sometimes at Newmarkett, y<sup>e</sup> knowe that has alwaies bin a place, where changes have bin prest; and having little other support, then what y<sup>r</sup> innocense and merit gives y<sup>e</sup>, may finde benefit in being present y<sup>r</sup> selfe . . .

1688

Sir John Reresby records on February 24 :—

. . . The town's discourse was generally concerning the difference of the two lords, where my Lord Halifax, who had discovered the cheat, had the general applause [;] that day <sup>1</sup> my lord told me the Duke made it his business to clear himself from being concerned in the least on either side, and that his highness should come to him before his lordship would apply himself to his highness in that affair. That his lordship had been the day before with the King, and was two hours in private with him, where he took notice of a report that my Lord Rochester was to have the white staff of Lord High Treasurer given him; but his lordship hoped it was not intended, because at that time it would look ill in respect of the difference between the two lords, and seem to throw the right on that side where his Majesty bestowed so great a sign of his favour; that the King said he should not be Lord Treasurer the sooner for what had lately been done by my Lord Rochester in that concern; and was angry with my Lord Halifax that he gave credit to any such rumour.

On February 28 <sup>2</sup> Sir John adds :—

My Lord Halifax told me the Duke had assured him that he was not concerned in the least in the difference between him and my Lord Rochester. My lord replied he was sure his highness would never do an ill thing towards him; and if he did, that his lordship would never do anything to oppose him,<sup>3</sup> but he could not serve him with the same zeal, and he might at some time repent he had lost his service to the degree he desired to use it for him; that he had done in all this no more than he was commanded to do by the King, and who was there so great <sup>4</sup> in the kingdom to be displeased with a man's acting according to the King's command? that he found they had a mind, meaning Rochester, to be rid of him, and would possibly endeavour to make his station uneasy, but they should not remove him; first, because he would stay to serve the King, and secondly, to disappoint those that endeavoured to contrive his absence; that all his lordship had attempted to do in this matter was to save the King's money, and could there be a greater service to his Highness in future than that; that the King had made him a bigger man than he deserved to be, but he was a gentleman, and that his highness ought to consider

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 270.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 271.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. his succession.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. not even the Heir-Presumptive.

1682 those that had escutcheons as well as those that had none (three of the Duke's chief favourites, viz., Legge, Churchill, and Hyde, being scarce gentlemen). For his part, that he would never say any thing but truth to his highness; but though it might look a little plain, yet nothing could carry more respect in the bottom, than truth,<sup>1</sup> with much to the same effect. To which the Duke replied, that whatever he said did seem very reasonable; that he was sensible of great obligations he had to his lordship, and would never forget them, but would serve him in what lay in his power, and his lordship should find it.

The same day his lordship said he had spoken to my lady Duchess of Portsmouth, and told her, upon some discourse, that he found, in case of need of his Majesty's favour, he was not to expect many friends from that side of Whitehall; that she replied, that some that had been much his friends came thither sometimes (meaning Rochester<sup>2</sup>), and she hoped they would be so again. His lordship replied that he doubted much, however, of her intercession in such a strait, and hoped he should avoid coming into the danger of making use of it; at which she blushed, and seemed to be in some confusion. He said further that were he as young as he had been, he could be as well with her as others.

The Court and the whole town (adds Reresby) seemed infinitely divided upon this matter. Those that had any dependence upon payments out of the exchequer durst not but seem to side with Lord Rochester; those that were thinking, serious men, who were independent and wished well to the Government, commended the zeal and courage of my Lord Privy Seal, who would not see 40,000*l.* of the King's money mis-employed,<sup>3</sup> and who durst complain of it, where so great a man with his dependents were made enemies by it.

In the City<sup>4</sup> a general opinion prevailed that the Exchequer was mismanaged; that the Lord Privy Seal had merited well by his attempt; and that the indifference

<sup>1</sup> Lord Halifax seems to have been as tolerant as he was prodigal of criticism. Among the *Spencer MSS.* is a letter from Robert Spencer to Lord Halifax reflecting on the climate of the Northern counties: 'no complement' (he admits) 'to a Northern Lord, but I know you love truth.'

<sup>2</sup> It would seem more natural to suppose that she alluded to Sunderland.

<sup>3</sup> About May, Halifax seems to have interfered in the settlement of the Irish revenue. The term having expired, Ormonde, who considered the farmers oppressive and unpunctual, urged that it should not be renewed. Rochester sided with him, but the farmers offered large advances, and were, so Carte asserts, 'secretly encouraged by the Marquis of Halifax . . . who set up for a general reformer of all abuses put upon the King, not only in the management, but in the disposal of his revenue, and who was in hopes that he should have an advantage to accuse the lords of the treasury for rejecting the proposals, if the King should not make so much of his revenue by management as the farmers had offered . . . it was at last resolved to put it into management' (*Ormonde*, iv. 642).

<sup>4</sup> Reresby, *Memoirs*, March 5, p. 273.

with which his disclosures had been received was surprising. On hearing this, Halifax told Reresby 'it was necessary for him to estrange himself from my Lord Rochester, lest he might be thought to be privy, if not, a party, to some things of which the other was suspected.' 168

It is a greate satisfaction to me (writes Lord Weymouth, March 9<sup>th</sup>) to finde y<sup>r</sup> L<sup>ty</sup> soe well resolved to heare what y<sup>r</sup> Malice of y<sup>r</sup> enemies may designe against y<sup>n</sup>, who y<sup>n</sup> must expect will leave noe stone unturned to ease them selves of one of y<sup>r</sup> vertue, and though the Kg was pleased I heare to iustifie y<sup>r</sup> part in that matter, yet y<sup>e</sup> knighting of Trant<sup>2</sup> was a new way of rewarding the service he did, and w<sup>ch</sup> others make use of in triumph after the victory.

It also appears that Lord Halifax was regarded as the instigator of a new financial scheme which promised to increase the revenue by nearly one-fourth;<sup>3</sup> and that 'my Lord Rochester as much underhand discouraged' it, 'inasmuch as he sent to some of the richest citizens, desiring them not to concern their estates in this project. This' (says Reresby) 'one Hornby, a banker, worth 80,000*l.* by

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (21).

<sup>2</sup> One of the farmers.

<sup>3</sup> Reresby, March 5. 'The King's revenue' (he says) 'came now to about 110,000*l.* [*sic*; surely 1,100,000*l.* per annum, and there was a project on foot to farm it, and offers were made of it accordingly at 140,000*l.* [*sic*; surely 1,400,000*l.* per annum by sufficient persons, and 500,000*l.* was offered to be paid beforehand as a security, and not to be deducted till the last half-year; this farm to continue for three years. My Lord Privy Seal was believed to be the chief promoter, &c. (See also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 351; misplaced by a year; it should be March 22, 1682, not 1681.) The Lord Privy Seal's friends are said to offer 105,000*l.* per mensem and to advance 600,000*l.* at six per cent., to pay off debts and contingencies, and to make the Exchequer the bank for the same. Some reported that Rochester's friends would go high. The unfortunate officials of the Court, whose salaries were painfully in arrear, rejoiced at these suggestions (*ibid.* and Burnet). The *Dutch Despatches* also give full particulars of this scheme. (See *Despatches Open*, March 16, 1682.) The Lord Marquis, with some others under him, offer to farm the entire revenue at an increase of 200,000*l.* per annum; and to advance the Exchequer immediately 600,000*l.* at 6 per cent., whereby his Majesty shall be enabled to pay off an equivalent debt for which he is now paying 10, 12, 14 per cent.; which sum is to be gradually deducted from the annual payments of the farmers. A large surplus would thus remain available for the discharge of the king's debts, especially arrears of wages and salaries, in consequence of which the said Lord Marquis is much considered. March 30. The scheme is not favoured by his Majesty. The Treasury approves a certain Colonel Freind and his partners, who are anxious to undertake the farm of the general excise only at the rate of 530,000*l.* per annum (an advance of 50,000*l.* per annum on the present farm). They also offer a preliminary advance of 150,000*l.* March 30, April 9. The persons designated by the Lord Marquis of Halifax who are ready to farm the entire revenue — some say, for 1,700,000*l.* — are to be heard to-morrow; and the excise farm is to be put up to auction on Monday.



1682 reputation, confessed to me. It was much admired<sup>1</sup> that any one durst withstand so great an advance to the Crown for his private interest. My Lord Privy Seal,' he adds, 'thanked me for this discovery.'

On March 20 he records :—

My Lord Privy Seal and I went to Hyde Park. He told me he hoped I did not repent of my coming up at his request, since I could not have been so well satisfied how affairs went, both public and private, without being there ; that he knew not how long he should keep his station (being driven at so fiercely by some) ; but he did think he had the King his friend, and could not believe that he would part with him for having committed no fault, except it were one to obey his commands [;] assuring me that he would ever use his interest so long as it continued to serve me. . . . But, said he, times may come, if the Court should fall into French councils,<sup>2</sup> . . . and if that come to pass, I must quit [my station], for I have greater endeavours against me from the other side of the water than from home.<sup>3</sup> . . .<sup>4</sup> When I came<sup>5</sup> into the country he bade me turn the report of his disgrace into raillery, till he gave me notice of his retreat, which he would do early if he found it was not to be avoided.

A few days later<sup>6</sup> Reresby reported that Lord Danby, who had already remained three years in the Tower, spoke 'obligingly' of the Lord Privy Seal, especially of his attempts to procure a Parliament, on which the hopes of the prisoner were now fixed as the means upon which was based his only hope of release. Nor had the Earl refrained from reflections upon Rochester and his party, with the untrustworthy 'interest' on which they relied. Lord Halifax took the information, we do not doubt, with

April <sup>3</sup>/<sub>17</sub> : Yesterday the Lords of the Treasury with some of the Privy Council assembled to consider the farm of the excises. The King decided not to farm them, but to have them managed by commissioners. By January 16<sup>54</sup>/<sub>84</sub> Halifax had withdrawn his active support from the projectors 'because it would trench too much on my Lord Rochester to suffer that to be done' (Reresby ; British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, ff. 420b, 428, 433, 439).

<sup>1</sup> I.e. wondered.

<sup>2</sup> This must mean that Halifax anticipated the possibility of a formal alliance, offensive and defensive, between the Crowns.

<sup>3</sup> See *ante*, pp. 374, 375 ; also Preston, *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 280, 281, 340.

<sup>4</sup> Reresby told Halifax that if he retained office he must rise yet higher ; and, if possible, Reresby should himself like to serve under the Marquis. If, on the other side, the Marquis should be disgraced, Reresby himself would not care to serve further ; and, in any case, would stay in no longer than he could act 'upon safe and sure principles' (p. 274).

<sup>5</sup> I.e. should come.

<sup>6</sup> March 22, 23 (Reresby's *Memoirs*, pp. 274, 275).

a grain of salt ; but met the overture in a friendly spirit : 1682  
for his enmity to Danby was by now 'much abated.'

He told me (says Sir John) he had enemies enough besides, and that his displeasure against him was now ceased ; but he would not make more enemies by being his friend, as he had formerly done by being his enemy. So that I found (proceeds Reresby) my Lord Privy Seal making up his interest on one side, as my Lord Rochester was endeavouring on the other ; for he had 'also sent for Mr. Seymour to return to Court, and had promised to be his friend. My Lord Privy Seal told me that Seymour had made some proposals to close with him, and that a reconciliation was endeavoured by Rochester's friends between the two lords. I told his lordship that, in my poor opinion, he had better stand upon his own interest than join with either, for he had now gotten a national interest by what he had done, in opposition to Rochester. In case he closed there again, he might lose that ; and if he could support himself separate, he might keep both ; or in case he fell, the King would find the want of him so much, he could not be long spared from Court.' He said it would be hard for him to continue there with these men, for it was their interest to remove him. 'They would be apt to play tricks for their own advantage ; and knew so long as he was in a station to be informed of such carriages, he should ever reveal them to his Majesty. He said further, that if they should get the King to themselves, they could not long keep him, for he had one quality that would preserve him from being very long in ill hands, which was he would hear all persons, and admit of informations by the back door, when those that seemed favourites little dreamed of it.'<sup>2</sup> He lamented the interest that the Duchess of Portsmouth had with the King, she betraying him to France, not only as to his councils, but in his affections. He said the King was too passive in these things, and that it was his greatest fault that he would not be persuaded to resent some things which he clearly saw, as he ought, and keep up that height which belonged to his dignity.

In fine, the Minister warned Sir John to make as many friends as possible.

Upon the whole matter (concludes Reresby) I perceived my Lord Privy Seal had the better and most approved cause, and my Lord Rochester the better interest. The first weighed more in parts, in his family, estate, and his reputation in the nation ; the other weighed more, though undeservedly, with the Duke of York, the Duchess of Portsmouth, my Lord of Ormond, and most of those at Court, who depended upon the King's purse, of which his lordship was the chief dispenser. And the fear was

<sup>1</sup> Does this apply to Halifax or Rochester ? Lord Weymouth (March 9) had begged Halifax to secure the alliance of Seymour (*Spencer MSS.* 31).

<sup>2</sup> See *Character of Charles II.*

1682<sup>22</sup><sub>83</sub> that the diligence of these so near the King might work upon him, so as to relinquish my Lord Privy Seal, who depended upon no other person nor interest but his own; and those services that he not only had performed, but was best able to render the Crown.

The estimate of Reresby is, no doubt, perfectly just; but although the character and policy of Lord Rochester inspire very little respect, it is difficult to suppress a momentary spasm of sympathy. As a Ministerial colleague, Lord Halifax, with his ostentation of political virtue, must have been singularly exasperating.

Of equal interest to us, at the period in question, is the consideration of these events as they affect the estimate of Halifax entertained among the opponents of the Court. 'The Whigs . . . or . . . anti-courtiers,' says Reresby,<sup>1</sup> 'commended Lord Privy Seal not only for the thing, but as hoping to gain him by this quarrel to more moderation.' Indeed, we find that Halifax himself told Reresby<sup>2</sup> 'the anti-Court party courted him at so great a rate, he feared it might occasion a jealousy elsewhere.' On the other hand, the most extreme section of the party appear to have blamed Lord Halifax for attempting the improvement of the revenue, because this might render the King more independent of Parliament.

It is possible that the overtures of the more moderate section were made through Dr. Burnet. An interview certainly took place between the statesman and the divine, but at the instance of the Lord Privy Seal himself; for, says Burnet,<sup>3</sup> 'I went no more near any that belonged to the Court.' Lord Halifax told Burnet the circumstance of the Treasury frauds, and the Doctor asked how his lordship stood with the King. 'He answered,' records our author, 'that neither he nor I had the making of the king: God had made him of a particular composition. He said, he knew what the king said to himself: I,' adds Burnet, 'asked him, if he knew likewise what he said to others.'

There is reason, however, to believe that the state of affairs remained more or less intact until, in the end of the following June, the so-called Rye House revelations electrified England. With the details of this affair we have, of course, no concern; but a brief sketch will explain the view which a very detailed examination of all the evidence extant has induced us to adopt.

<sup>1</sup> February 28 (*Memoirs*, p. 272).

<sup>2</sup> February 21 (*ibid.* p. 270).

<sup>3</sup> Edit. 1833, vol. ii. p. 340.

We have already adverted to the terror which the election of Tory sheriffs, a year earlier,<sup>1</sup> had created in Whig circles. The apprehensions of Shaftesbury, in particular, whose mind appears to have been somewhat untinged by continued ill health, and by the anxieties of his recent imprisonment, seem to have verged upon the insane. He had thrown himself, with crazy vehemence, into schemes of insurrection, and had found active agents among the members of the 'Green Ribbon' <sup>2</sup> Club, a powerful Whig organisation capable of considerable development on the lines of a secret society. Upon the collapse of his schemes, which had met with the strongest opposition from Lord Russell and the Duke of Monmouth,<sup>3</sup> Shaftesbury had fled the country - to die, a few weeks later, in Holland. Contemporaries noticed, with interest, that Lord Halifax, among other of his connections, assumed mourning on the occasion.<sup>4</sup> After his death the City agitation had revived,<sup>5</sup> under the auspices of a subordinate agent, and with it a plot for the assassination of the King and Duke,<sup>6</sup> which had originated, during the preceding autumn, among the more abandoned of Lord Shaftesbury's associates. Meanwhile, in the highest ranks of Whig society, certain meetings had been inaugurated by Lord Howard of Esrick, a prominent member of the Green Ribbon Club, who to the reputation of a political adventurer joined a subtle personal fascination. He had obtained considerable ascendancy over the minds of Lord Essex, the Duke of Monmouth, and Algernon Sidney (in the latter case by the profession of Republican sympathies); and all three are known to have attended his meetings. Lord Russell,

<sup>1</sup> June, 1682.

<sup>2</sup> Or King's Head. Compare the list of the Club given by Wade (British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,845, f. 282) with the names of those implicated in the conspiracy. North's account of the Club (*Examen*, p. 572) is very amusing.

<sup>3</sup> This is clear, from all the existing evidence. But it is practically certain that in the event of an actual outbreak the two would have thrown in their lot with the insurgents. It is not easy to date the saying of Lord Russell recorded by Lord Halifax in the Devonshire House 'note book,' importing that Lord Shaftesbury 'would spoyle everything he had to do with.' Russell and Shaftesbury appear to have been intimate until the autumn of 1682, and after that date it is difficult to conceive of Lords Halifax and Russell as upon speaking terms.

<sup>4</sup> *Hatton Correspondence*, ii. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Spring of 1683.

<sup>6</sup> It has been asserted, on the authority of Robert Ferguson, that Shaftesbury was cognisant of this plot, and forwarded operations. It is certain that Russell had no suspicion of its existence, and that Monmouth, to whom it was revealed, repudiated it with horror. If we may believe Ferguson, the Duke actually frustrated the plot by deliberate counter-intrigue.

1683 on the other hand, frequented them under protest;<sup>1</sup> actuated, as appears probable, by a kindly solicitude for the Duke of Monmouth,<sup>2</sup> whose natural amiability awakened a rather pathetic interest in the breast of the elder man.<sup>3</sup> The proceedings of this debating club, for it amounted to little more, assuredly never constituted any real peril to the Government; it was neither numerous nor coherent; its futility was the object of scorn to the City politicians, who had learnt of its existence through the instrumentality of Howard; and a few weeks before the final crash it appears to have died a natural death. There is scarcely a doubt, however, that its discussions, under statutes then existing, involved the penalties of treason; or that certain members, including Howard, Sidney, and Hampden 'the Younger' (a youth more distinguished by learning and enthusiasm than by political discretion), had seriously contemplated an appeal to arms.<sup>4</sup>

\* <sup>1</sup> Russell's *Life of Russell*, ii. 263.

<sup>2</sup> See note to Ralph, i. 757.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Russell had never been a political partisan of the Duke of Monmouth. Their intimacy probably dated from September 1682, when the Duke of Monmouth, during a somewhat ostentatious progress in the Midlands, was recalled by the Government under temporary arrest. He despatched a messenger to consult his friends. Shaftesbury counselled evasion and revolt; Russell denounced the suggestion as insane; and the Duke abandoned the 'counsel of Achitophel' for the advice of his more prudent friend (Grey's *Secret History*). In his dying speech Lord Russell spoke of a proposal to obtain possession of Whitehall by mastering the sentries, which had been subsequently made in his presence, but against which he had strenuously remonstrated. 'The Duke of Monmouth,' he adds, 'took me by the hand, and told me very kindly, "My Lord, I see you and I are of a temper; did you ever hear so horrid a thing?" And I must needs,' concludes Lord Russell, 'do him justice to declare that I ever observed in him an abhorrence of all base things.' Yet the character of Monmouth contained much that was alien to his devout and high-principled friend, who no doubt numbered him among those of his associates in whose escape he, while awaiting the execution of his own sentence, specially rejoiced, because they 'had not lived so as to be fit to die' (*Life*, ii. 268). Monmouth certainly repaid the solicitude of his friend by assiduous anxiety for his posthumous reputation. (See his journal in Welwood (November 26), and the examination of Sir James Forbes (*Lords' Journal*, November 20, 1689].)

<sup>4</sup> In the 'Discourses' published during 1698, but which we assign on internal evidence to the last year of Sidney's life, there are some significant words on the preterability of civil war to an acquiescence in tyranny (*Works*, 1772, p. 479). We may mention, moreover, that in a memorandum at Devonshire House, in the hand of Lord Halifax (of which the remainder will be given later on), it is said: 'That as soon as ever the D. of Monmouth came in,' (i.e. surrendered—end of 1683) 'his brother' (Sidney's—i.e. Henry Sidney, afterwards Lord Sidney and Earl of Romney) 'desired him' (probably Algernon's servant Duca-se) 'to go to him' (Monmouth) 'and moove him to speak to the K: for him,' (Algernon) 'and that very night the D. told L.<sup>d</sup> Sydney that it was impossible to save him; hee was such an enemy to the Gov.' It is remarkable that Lord Russell, who was almost nervously anxious to avoid compromising his friends, and who denies

It was early in June 1683 that a false brother betrayed 1683 to the authorities both the intrigues of the City agitators and the existence of the assassination conspiracy. The heads of the 'Green Ribbon' society, warned in time, implored Russell to give the signal for revolt; he responded 'that it was better some private men should suffer than that the public should be precipitated;' <sup>1</sup> and this answer paralysed the conspirators, most of whom were arrested in the act of flight. The evidence of informers soon compromised the members of Lord Howard's circle. Before the end of the month Lords Russell and Essex, John Hampden, Algernon Sidney, &c., were in the Tower; <sup>2</sup> the Duke of Monmouth and Lord Grey had absconded; and Lord Howard had turned king's evidence. The conviction of the 'assassination' plotters <sup>3</sup> was immediately followed by the suicide of Lord Essex, and by the indictment of Lord Russell <sup>4</sup> upon a charge of high treason: on July 14 he received sentence of death. •

The hold which Lord Russell possessed upon the affections of his party was thrown into vivid relief by the glare of these tragic occurrences. Remorse, it was known, had been a determining factor in the despair of Lord Essex, to whose remonstrances the fatal intercourse between Howard and Russell had been originally due. Lord Cavendish, afterwards first Duke of Devonshire,

that the peace of the nation was ever actually endangered, incidentally admits that, while he had committed no treason, he had heard a great deal. (See the introduction prefixed to the *Letters of Lady Russell*, pp. lxxiv, xci, cxxv, cxxxvi, cxxxvii. See also Burnet, British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,581. ff. 104, 105*b* these passages were written in 1684.)

<sup>1</sup> This remarkable statement, which will be found in the confession of Wade, a very reliable witness (British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,845, L 268*b*), has never, we think, attracted the attention of historians.

<sup>2</sup> The order to seize Sidney's papers is countersigned by Halifax among others (British Museum, *Essex MSS.* 2,618, f. 140, June 25, 1683).

<sup>3</sup> *Tr. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., part 5, p. 86, Lord Conway writes a very amusing letter to Lord Dartmouth, whose name had been mentioned among the intended victims of the plot. 'What would my Lord Halifax have given to have been in that bead-roll of sacrifice?' It would have contributed more to his design than either his marquisship or privy seal, and most loudly would he have magnified himself upon it. I am sure you are not displeased that my cousin Seymour hath shewed his activity' (in arresting suspects). It appears, however, from the *Dutch Despatch* (*Open*) of <sup>June 20,</sup> <sup>July 6,</sup> quoting the Duke of York, that the name of Halifax was mentioned in this connection.

<sup>4</sup> He was the only one of the 'great men' in custody against whom two witnesses were available. Two men were able to swear that he had been present at a meeting during the preceding year whereat Shaftesbury had been expected, and at which, as was alleged, treasonable conversation had taken place. Their evidence, however, owing to a curious technical defect, was legally inadmissible.

1683 exhausted a fertile imagination in Quixotic schemes of evasion and rescue; the Duke of Monmouth transmitted a chivalrous offer to 'come in, and run fortunes' with his ill-fated comrade.<sup>1</sup> The relations of Russell meanwhile strained every nerve to obtain a remission of the sentence, nor did they want for sympathy and patronage. The character of the prisoner commanded almost universal respect; even the personal adherents of the Duke of York saw in Lady Russell the daughter of the eminent Cavalier, Lord Southampton, and both Rochester and Dartmouth made application in the highest quarters.<sup>2</sup>

Lord Halifax, on his part, showed particular interest, and his motives, both from a national and an individual point of view, were exceedingly urgent. It seems probable that he believed in the moral innocence of the victim,<sup>3</sup> for we find among the 'Devonshire MSS.' this memorandum, in his own handwriting:—

L<sup>d</sup> Russell told D. Tillotson the night before hee died, that hee never was of opinion to redresse things otherwise than by p<sup>h</sup>.

Said at the same time, that it was once in their power to have overturned the Gov<sup>t</sup>.

In any case, it was clear that the evidence upon which Lord Russell had been convicted was both meagre and, technically speaking, invalid;<sup>4</sup> and that his execution would in consequence arouse a passion of resentment and raise the sufferer to a very ominous height in the roll of political martyrs. On the other hand, a pardon upon terms must have compromised for ever his political importance, while enhancing to an indefinite degree the popularity of the Government, and smoothing the way for more pacific relations among parties.

<sup>1</sup> The point of this proposal lay in the fact that the evidence against Monmouth and Russell was practically identical. It seemed scarcely credible that Charles should proceed to the last extremity against his son, and this circumstance might have compelled him, as a matter of policy, to spare the life of his son's associate. Lord Russell thought otherwise, and met the Duke's suggestion with the simple rejoinder that his own case would be none the better 'though his friends should die with him.'

<sup>2</sup> See Burnet, edit. 1833, ii. 380; and Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, p. 120.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Halifax, in his references to the trial of Lord Stafford, claims credit for having been actuated solely by motives of conscience, and Lord Weymouth (letter of August 20 in this year, *Spencer MSS.* 31 '34) appeals to Halifax for a reprieve in a case of manslaughter, basing the application on the 'tenderness' in matters of blood for which the Marquis was notorious.

<sup>4</sup> See *ante*, p. 391, note 4.

Nor were more personal considerations lacking. Lord 1683  
Halifax was connected with Lady Russell by the ties of a double affinity,<sup>1</sup> and the relations between himself and her husband, though probably never close,<sup>2</sup> must have been at one time constant. Under the influence of these various motives the Lord Privy Seal 'showed a very compassionate concern' for his former colleague and 'all the readiness to serve him that could be wished.'<sup>3</sup> It is even asserted, on the authority of 'Lady' Portsmouth,<sup>4</sup> that had others unspecified displayed equal urgency 'Lord Russell might have been saved.' It was to Halifax that Drs. Tillotson and Burnet,<sup>5</sup> 'confident his lordship would do the Lord Russell all the good he could,' at once directed their applications when circumstances suggested that Russell was prepared to recant his former opinions concerning the limits of political obedience.<sup>6</sup>

Dr Burnet (says Lord Halifax himself<sup>7</sup>) came to Dr Tillotson and told him that hee had now brought my L<sup>d</sup> Russell to be sensible of the unlawfulness of Resistance, and desired him to acquaint mee with it, that I might tell it to the King, as that which might in some degree soften him towards my L<sup>d</sup>. Dr Tillotson accordingly told this to mee, and I took the first

<sup>1</sup> Lady Russell was cousin to the first Lady Halifax and sister-in-law, by her first marriage, of Lady Vaughan (Lady Anne Savile).

<sup>2</sup> Because Russell had always belonged to the Shaftesbury wing of the Country party.

<sup>3</sup> Tillotson's examination before the 'Murder' Committee of 1689 (*Lords' Journal*).

<sup>4</sup> As the Duchess was often designated. See Mackintosh's quotation from the *Halifax MSS. (History of the English Revolution, p. 10, note):* 'The Duchess of Portsmouth said to Lord Montague, that if others had been as earnest as my Lord Halifax with the King Lord Russell might have been saved. Other allusions' (so Sir James proceeds) 'in the MSS. which I ascribe to Lord Halifax, shew that his whole fault was a continuing in office after the failure of his efforts to save Lord Russell.' (The passage given above *does not appear* in the Devonshire House 'note book,' usually cited by Sir James as the *Halifax MSS.*, and this circumstance proves that when lent to Mr. Fox and to Mackintosh the 'note book' was accompanied by other MSS., probably memoranda on loose sheets, similar to the account of the Tillotson incident still preserved with the 'note book,' and quoted in full above.)

<sup>5</sup> The divines in attendance on the condemned man.

<sup>6</sup> Among the *Bodleian MSS.* is a remarkable letter from Dr. Stillingfleet to Halifax, dated August 8, about a fortnight after Russell's execution, and evidently written in answer to inquiries from the Lord Privy Seal. Stillingfleet analyses in detail the passages in Bracton, Fortescue, and other early authorities, relied upon by the opponents of passive obedience, and refutes, to his own satisfaction, the interpretation thus put upon them (*Tanner MSS.* 34 [102]).

<sup>7</sup> Loose sheet found with the Halifax 'note book' at Devonshire House. The story is told by Tillotson himself in his examination before the 'Murder' Committee of the House of Lords, 1689.



1683 opportunity of acquainting the King with it, and improved it the best I could for his advantage; <sup>1</sup> D<sup>r</sup> Tillotson in the meantime goeth to my L<sup>d</sup> Russell to tell him how glad hee was of what D<sup>r</sup> Burnet had informed him; My L<sup>d</sup> said that D<sup>r</sup> Burnet was under a mistake, for that he had only said that hee was willing to bee convinced, but not that hee was so; upon this, D<sup>r</sup> Tillotson expostulateth with D<sup>r</sup> Burnet for misinforming him, and for making him the instrument to send mee with a wrong message to the King. D<sup>r</sup> Burnet confesseth that he said it positively to D<sup>r</sup> Tillotson, though my L<sup>d</sup> onely said it in such a manner as gave him hopes hee would bee converted from his former opinion, but hee took it in the largest sense, because hee beleeveth it might do him a good office to the King; D<sup>r</sup> Tillotson upon this, the day before his execution, goeth to my L<sup>d</sup> to discourse with him upon the same subiect, and withall carryeth with him a letter written by himselfe, to give my L<sup>d</sup>, to consider of it, which hee did, and afterwards said there was more said against the lawfulnessse of resistance than hee thought could have been; D<sup>r</sup> Tillotson bringeth this paper to mee to justify himselfe, and to rectify the mistake made by D<sup>r</sup> Burnet; this was the night before the execution, which being done the next morning my L<sup>d</sup>'s speech cometh out <sup>2</sup> which being contrary to what I had told from him, gave some dissatisfaction at Court against the D<sup>r</sup>, who having left this paper with mee, being interrupted by the Spanish Ambassadour, who came to see mee whilst the D<sup>r</sup> was with mee, I having perused it, shewed it to Sir T. Clergis, and I cannot remember whether to anybody else, so that the K. heard of it (but not till after L<sup>d</sup> Russell was executed.) and order was given to have it printed.<sup>3</sup>

In point of fact, the dying speech of Lord Russell, which had been very carefully prepared, was regarded by the Court as a kind of party manifesto, and a very unfounded suspicion arose that it was really the work of another hand. Dr. Burnet was specially suspected, and he as well as Tillotson appears to have been examined in Council the same evening. The authenticity of the obnoxious paper was, however, stoutly maintained by both

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Tillotson says that Lord Halifax readily undertook the commission, and reported that the King seemed more moved than by anything which had been urged before. The Duke of Monmouth (extracts from his *Diary* printed by Welwood) positively insists, alleging the King's own subsequent statements, that Charles himself had long wavered, but finally yielded under severe pressure from his inexorable brother of York.

<sup>2</sup> It was selling in the streets, as a matter of fact, within an hour of the execution.

<sup>3</sup> This last part of the story is given in the evidence of Dr. Tillotson, and in an account compiled by Ralph (*Histon*, i. 753, from the versions of L'Estrange and Echard), with slight variations here rectified by the authority of the Marquis himself. A copy of Dr. Tillotson's letter to Lord Russell, endorsed by Lord Halifax, is at Devonshire House.

divines ; and Burnet, with an audacity which commands respect, corroborated his assertion by reading aloud a very laudatory journal of his week's intercourse with Lord Russell. The Marquis, who was present, sent the Doctor word 'That the duke looked on [his] reading the journal as a studied thing, to make a panegyric on lord Russell's memory.'<sup>1</sup> 168.

The good offices of Halifax did not cease with the death of the noble-hearted 'Tribune,'<sup>2</sup> but were actively employed on behalf of the dead man's family. We cannot tell whether Halifax had enjoyed the friendship of Lady Russell during those happier days when to the strong affections, strong sense, and strong religious principle which always characterised her she still joined the lively grace (dower of a Southern ancestry<sup>3</sup>) which one terrible month shattered for ever. The memorials of their intercourse begin with this dismal era, and reveal a mutual esteem honourable to both parties. Almost the first letter which Lady Russell compelled herself to write, after the fatal day of her widowhood, was a letter of thanks<sup>4</sup> to Lord Halifax :

*Lady Russell to the Marquis of Halifax.*<sup>5</sup>

'Tis so much my interest, my Lord, (relying as I do upon your Lordship's judgment and favour to me,) to be careful in humbly acknowledging those I do receive, that unless you will be strictly just to me, you will imagine this is sent your Lordship from other ends than upon my word it is, since I could never in expectance of a future advantage by it, constrain myself to do uneasy things, (as doing this is, to so discomposed a mind as mine) ; but to be kindly used, and not any way appear I have a sense of it, would, if it be possible, add to that intolerable pressure my sad heart mourns under. All other considerations would permit me to excuse myself from, or at least to deter an exercise I am rendered so utterly unfit for ; especially unless I might complain in such sad words as my raging griefs fill my amazed mind with, and indeed offers me no other without putting a force upon myself, which being unfit to do at this time, I ask your Lordship's pardon for what I have said, and in

<sup>1</sup> Burnet, upon this hint, retired to the Continent for a time.

<sup>2</sup> The 'Tribune of the People' is the title ascribed to Lord Russell in the *Seasonable Address to both Houses of Parliament* (1687).

<sup>3</sup> Her mother had been a French Protestant lady, a sister of M. de Ruvigny the elder.

<sup>4</sup> This letter is already well known, but its importance, in view of subsequent events, demands its insertion.

<sup>5</sup> *Some Account of the Life of Rachel Wriothesley, Lady Russell, &c., prefixed to the Letters* edited in 1819 (by Miss Berry), p. 40.

1683 real compassion as to one very miserable, you must give it to, my Lord,

Yours, &c., &c.

I think fit to acquaint your Lordship that I have written to my uncle Russell,<sup>1</sup> to present my thanks to the King,<sup>2</sup> but have intimated in another paper that he may, if he sees fit, read it to the King, having written it with that design: if this be enough, I like it better than doing more, but if your Lordship is of another mind, tell but my Lord Vaughan<sup>3</sup> so, and I shall know it before the letter be given. If it be seasonable to move in the other, I presume your Lordship will not forget me.

I hear the serjeant<sup>4</sup> has been troublesome to your Lordship; it would be impertinent to trouble you with all that has passed, but I think I have not been to blame, for he demanded it only upon the account that I was to have the personal estate, and I promised him satisfaction when I had the grant.<sup>5</sup>

Lord Halifax answered as follows:—

• *The Marquis of Halifax to Lady Russell.*<sup>6</sup>

Madam,—It is enough that my zeal to serve you is favourably received; but it doth not deserve so much notice as your Ladyship is pleased to take of it. I am ready to give myself a better title than yet I have to such obliging acknowledgements whenever you will give me the opportunity, by laying your commands on me. In the mean time, I will not offer anything to your Ladyship's thoughts, to soften or allay the violence of your affliction, since your own excellent temper, and the great measure of reason you are blessed with, will best furnish you with the means of doing it. I have not seen Colonel Russell, to speak with him, concerning the letter your Ladyship mentioned; but, according to my present thoughts, if he delivereth a compliment from you to his Majesty, by your order, it may be less liable to inconvenience, or exception, than any thing that is put on paper. I must tell your Ladyship, there has been such a stir kept about setting up the scutcheon,<sup>7</sup> and so much weight laid upon it by some, who might have been more sparing for your sake, though they would not be it for mine, that I am clearly of opinion, it is advisable to stay yet, for a considerable time, before any thing is moved in the other business. There

<sup>1</sup> Probably Colonel Russell of the Guards, uncle to Lord Russell.

<sup>2</sup> For resigning his claim to the personal estate of Lord Russell as an attainted man.

<sup>3</sup> The brother of her first husband and son-in-law to Lord Halifax.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. Serjeant-at-Arms.

<sup>5</sup> The originals of this and the following letter are among the Duke of Devonshire's MSS.

<sup>6</sup> *Some Account of the Life of Rachel Wriothesley, Lady Russell, &c., prefixed to the Letters* edited in 1819 (by Miss Berry), p. 43.

<sup>7</sup> I.e., we presume, displaying a hatchment above the door of Southampton House, the residence of Lord and Lady Russell.

are some other particulars which confirm me in this opinion, 1683  
that I shall give you an account of when I have the honour to  
wait on you : for I would by no means have your Ladyship  
exposed to the danger of a refusal ; which is best prevented by  
taking a seasonable time, and letting the wrong impressions  
wear out that may have been given for the present.

In pursuance of the liberty I had from your Ladyship, I left  
it to my Lord Keeper to set down what was to be given to the  
sergeant ;<sup>1</sup> and he hath ordered 20*l.* which I have desired your  
servant to pay, that you may receive no further trouble in it.

I am, Madam,

Your Ladyship's most humble,  
and most obedient Servant,

HALIFAX.

London, October 16th, 1683.

Nor was Lord Russell the only sufferer to whom Lord  
Halifax extended a humane assistance. Algernon Sidney  
remained five months in the Tower, awaiting his trial.  
Among the 'Devonshire MSS.' is a memorandum, in the  
hand of Lord Halifax, evidently recorded some six years  
later, during the course of a determined attempt to affix  
upon the writer himself the stigma of the Rye House  
executions :—

(*Colonel*) Sydney

Du Cas<sup>2</sup> to bee sent for. Lt Sydney<sup>3</sup> can say, his brother  
thought him as good a friend as any hee had in the world.

That 'I did upon all occasions give him 'the best advice I  
could for the applying himselfe, before his tryall.'

As a matter of fact Joseph Ducasse (servant to Colonel  
Sidney), who, in evidence before the House of Lords some  
six years later,<sup>7</sup> complains that his master for some weeks  
after his arrest wanted even a change of linen, proceeds  
as follows :—

And I knowing that the Marquis of Halifax was his kins-  
man, I applied myself to him, and by his Means obtained  
Relief from some of those Grievances ; and, by his Lordship's

<sup>1</sup> 'Probably the Serjeant-at-Arms, who had the charge of Lord Russell  
in the Tower' (original note by Miss Berry).

<sup>2</sup> The confidential servant of Algernon Sidney, a native of Guienne, who  
had followed his master to England.

<sup>3</sup> L.e. Henry Sidney, created a peer after the Revolution.

<sup>4</sup> The ellipsis should probably be interpreted 'He can testify' or 'He  
testified.'

<sup>5</sup> Algernon.

<sup>6</sup> For other memoranda recorded on the same sheet see *ante*, pp. 390  
(note 4), 392, and *infra*, p. 405.

<sup>7</sup> *Lords' Journal*, xiv. 390.

1683 Means, I had the Liberty to visit Colonel Sydney during his Imprisonment.

Nor were the efforts of Lord Halifax confined to the amelioration of individual misery. His sagacity perceived from the first the importance of the political conjuncture. From a 'Moderate' point of view the results of the 'Rye House' revelations had been disastrous in the extreme; and the impetus thereby given to the spirit of reaction, to the rampant and rabid 'Toryism' of the 'Observator' and its compeers, gave ground for most serious misgiving. With the ineffectual importunity of a political Cassandra, Lord Halifax insisted that a policy of frank and cordial conciliation could alone extract from the circumstances of the moment a permanent advantage. Renewed urgency for the meeting of Parliament was apparent in all his demeanour;<sup>1</sup> and he never tired of representing that as the Royalist enthusiasm of the instant gave every prospect of a satisfactory session, so the issue of writs would be regarded as the omen and pledge of a popular<sup>2</sup> and constitutional<sup>3</sup> policy. Nor did he fail to insinuate that since, under the provisions of the Triennial Act, the session could not be deferred beyond March, a previous summons would be at once graceful and politic.

The suggestions of the Marquis, which derived no doubt additional energy from the very critical posture of Continental affairs, were promptly reported at the Court of Versailles, and excited the usual comments.

'I was told upon Sunday last,' writes Lord Preston on October 16,<sup>4</sup> 'by a minister, that they have accounts from England that upon a consultation whether the King should at this time call a Parliament or not, your lordship and Secretary Jenkins were for it, and that my Lords of Sunderland and Rochester opposed it, which method I can assure your lordship is making of Court here.' That Halifax, at one moment, did not despair of success is shown by the following letter, which also bears witness to the profound anxiety with which he beheld the advance of the Turkish arms, favoured by the unscrupulous diplomacy of France:—

<sup>1</sup> Barillon's despatch of July 23, quoted by Von Hanke, v. 242.

<sup>2</sup> 'un moyen, pour reunir tous ses sujets avec lui' (*ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> 'que son dessein n'est autre, que de conserver sa personne et le gouvernement sans rien faire contre les loix' (*ibid.*).

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 344.

*'From the Marquess of Halifax, Lord Privy Seal'  
[to the Earl of Chesterfield].*<sup>1</sup>

Aug. the 23. 1683.

My Lord,— It is a premeditated sinn in mee to break in on 1683  
your retirement, where you went to enjoy quiet and the enter-  
tainment of your own thoughts ; things very much to be preferd  
before any thing the town could afford you : but nobody is per-  
mitted to be happy in this world, where our friends and our  
enemies, though in differing kinds, both agree to persecute us.  
Thus your lordship seeth, that at the same time I am sensible of  
my fault, I go on in it like an impudent offendour ; but, I confess  
I am under a temptation that is to strong for mee ; and whilst I  
remember your lordship's generous and obliging manner of  
living with mee, I can not keep in my acknowledgements. They  
will some-times break out and trouble you ; for which you will  
forgive a man that is so full of his obligations to you. It would  
bee an ill returne, if I should envy your pleasures ; yet I may  
goe soe farre as to wish your lordship may find no such charms,  
in the country as to make you renounce the town ; which, with  
all its faults (of which it never had more than now,) hath stil  
something to recommend it, espetially in wi ter, when there is  
no more green left at Brethby, and that the joyes of your garden  
are frosen for some months. Then it is, we will hope your  
lordship may come up even without summons to a parliament.<sup>2</sup>  
In the mean time, we begin to be afraid to hear from Vienna.<sup>3</sup>  
The appearances are a little melancholy, tho' wee are com-  
forted with a great army gathering together for its reliefe ; but,  
if it should move so slowly, as to let the place bee lost, it would  
bee a scurvy after-game for that part of Christendome. What-  
ever becometh of the world, I must ever bee

My Lord, &c.

Impressed by the urgency of the crisis and by a sense  
of his own political impotence, Lord Halifax, it is evident,  
saw no hope of transforming the situation save by the intro-  
duction of some personal element which might neutralise  
the pernicious influence of the Duke of York. The Duke

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of the Second Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 246.

<sup>2</sup> An obvious hint, possibly the originating cause of the letter, since  
Lord Halifax would have naturally desired to prepare his own supporters  
as early as possible.

<sup>3</sup> The fall of that city before the victorious hordes of Turkey was eagerly  
anticipated by the selfish policy of France, desirous to have the Empire at  
her mercy (Burnet, ii. 392 ; and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 343b). The  
final repulse of the Turks was consequently a severe blow to French  
interests here and on the Continent. 'I give y<sup>e</sup> Lov<sup>e</sup>,' wrote Sir William  
Coventry to Halifax a month later, 'my most humble thanks for sending  
mee the good newes of the reliefe of Vienna though it is not very fashion-  
able, yett I cannot helpe being soe much a Christian as to bee glad the  
Turkes are beaten' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25], September 21).

1683 of Monmouth, as we knew, had absconded, and his generous offer to 'come in and run fortunes' with Lord Russell had been as generously refused. He had lurked in England all the summer with the secret connivance of his father,<sup>1</sup> and it is clear that Lord Halifax,<sup>2</sup> from the first, was smoothing the way of repentance. His objects are perfectly plain: he desired to establish, through the medium of his strongest affection, a hold upon the sluggish energies of the King, and regarded the Duke of Monmouth as a valuable prospective agent in the attempt to facilitate relations between the Government and the vanquished Whigs. Nor did Halifax, we are inclined to believe, sufficiently realise the very sinister interpretation to which his intervention was liable. The claims of the Duke of York were safe beyond the reach of cavil; Shaftesbury, the political sponsor of his rival, was no more; and in the recent consultations, whatever their scope, the Duke of Monmouth had figured as member of a threatened confederacy, and not as a political claimant.<sup>3</sup> The Marquis accordingly felt himself at liberty to ignore his former pretensions and to avail himself of the interest which the disgraced nobleman still retained in the breast of his Sovereign. His premises were certainly sound, but he erred in supposing that a policy so delicately adjusted could be appreciated by the ordinary mind. To

<sup>1</sup> At Toddington, in Bedfordshire, the seat of his mistress, the unhappy Lady Wentworth, where two adjoining rooms are still described as 'the Duke's' and 'my lady's' parlours. (See Carte's *Ormonde*; Roberts' *Life of Monmouth*, ii. 340; and the *Ailesbury Memoirs*, pp. 75-83.) Lord Bruce, afterwards second Earl of Ailesbury, eldest son of the Lord-Lieutenant of Bedfordshire, a staunch Tory, but a personal friend of the Duke of Monmouth, tells a somewhat pathetic story in this connection. Soon after the Duke's name had appeared in a proclamation for the arrest of the 'Rye House' plotters King Charles sent for Lord Bruce, and, informing him that 'James, for so he called the Duke of Monmouth,' was concealed at Toddington, gave him positive orders to effect the arrest. Lord Bruce, grasping the situation, gravely responded that the house being 'surrounded by fast ponds,' and well provided with underground vaults (an ingenious fiction of the moment), the task was impracticable. The King with transparent delight acquiesced in the simple artifice, and bade Lord Bruce hold himself in readiness for further orders, which, of course, were never issued; nor did he ever forget the young man's kindly subterfuge. A few weeks later, at a hunting party near Toddington, Lord Bruce recognised, in a tall man rustically attired, who mingled with the spectators, the handsome features of the Duke, and with some difficulty diverted the attention of the Lord-Lieutenant.

<sup>2</sup> In Carte's *Ormonde* it is stated that as early as July intimations were given the Duke of Monmouth that his offence would be condoned on a proper submission; but for some reason these overtures, which are ascribed to no one specifically, were not accepted (*ibid.* iv. 652).

<sup>3</sup> Lord Grey, who became a witness for the Crown in the next reign, is very clear on this point. (See his *Secret History*, p. 46.)

the average man—and as regards political tact the Duke of York was below the average—the Minister's patronage of the young Duke appeared an instance of tortuous political perfidy. 1683

On October 8, about four months after the disappearance of the Duke of Monmouth, the King went to Newmarket,<sup>1</sup> and a week later we obtain—from the 'Diary' of the Duke of Monmouth<sup>2</sup> himself, who was paying a surreptitious visit to London—our first lights as to the course of this singular negotiation:—

Oct. 13 (writes the Duke) L [Halifax?] came to me at eleven at night from 29, [the King?] told me 29 could never be brought to believe I knew anything of that part of the plot that concern'd *Rye House*:<sup>3</sup> but as things went, he must behave himself as if he did believe it, for some Reasons that might be for my advantage. L desir'd me to write to 29, which I refus'd; but afterwards told me 29 expected it: And I promis'd to write to-morrow; if he would call for the letter at S.<sup>4</sup> L shew'd a great concern for me, and I believe him sincere, though 3 is of another mind.

[October] 14. L came as he promised, and received the letter from 3 sealed, refusing to read it himself, though I had left it open with S. for that purpose.

At this point a question arises concerning the authorship of the letter here mentioned.<sup>5</sup> Lord Halifax subsequently told Burnet that the letters sent to the King in the Duke of Monmouth's name, which letters the Doctor admits to have been 'penned with an extraordinary force,' had been all composed by the Marquis himself, and he showed Burnet the original drafts in his own handwriting. But the statement of the Duke of Monmouth, given above, seems to suggest that the *first* letter of the series was really the Duke's own production; and as the style is far less literary than that of the second letter, which we may very confidently ascribe to the Marquis, it would appear that Burnet has fallen into a slight inaccuracy, and that the instructions of Lord Halifax in the earlier case had

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell.

<sup>2</sup> See the extracts printed by Welwood, *Memoirs*, second edit. 1700, appendix, p. 375 (the treatise drawn up at the desire and for the benefit of Queen Mary). Welwood had seen the *Diary*, of which he speaks in mysterious terms derogatory to James II. It had been taken from the person of Monmouth after Sedgemoor; its subsequent destination is unknown.

<sup>3</sup> The assassination branch of the plot.

<sup>4</sup> So Roberts. Some editions, at least, of the original have 'at which S.'

<sup>5</sup> Printed by Sprat, Ralph, and Roberts (*Life of Monmouth*, i. 153).



1688 been merely general. In this first and, we presume, original letter the Duke passionately repudiates any complicity in the murder scheme; drops mysterious hints as to a transaction in which his life had been ventured for the King's;<sup>1</sup> and promises a complete submission both to the King and Duke. For the next step in the negotiation we return to the 'Diary':—

[October] 20. L [Halifax?] came to me at S. with a line or two from 29 [the King?] very kind, assuring me he believed every word in my letter to be true; and advis'd me to keep hid, till he had an opportunity to express his Belief of it some other way. L told me he was going out of town next day;<sup>2</sup> and that 29 would send 80<sup>3</sup> to me in a day or two, whom he assured me I might trust.

On October 20, the day upon which this entry was made, the Court returned from Newmarket,<sup>4</sup> and four days later the Duke of Monmouth records:—

Oct. 25. L came for me to — where 29 was with 80. He received me pretty well.

Circumstances, as the Duke of Monmouth explains, delayed the second interview, which eventually took place on November 4.

I came (says the Duke) and found 29 and L there. He was very kind, and gave me directions how to manage my business, and what words I should say to 39.<sup>6</sup> . . .

It was probably on this occasion that as the Duke, 'wrapped up in a cloak,' left the Presence, he was met and recognised in a passage by Colonel (afterwards Lord) Griffin, who, hurrying to his Majesty, 'hastily and out of breath,' informed him the Duke of Monmouth was in the Court, and could be easily arrested. The King answered, with a disdainful air, 'You are a fool; James is at

<sup>1</sup> The extraordinary story told by Robert Ferguson (see Mr. James Ferguson's *Ferguson the Plotter*, on which we have already touched) may throw some light on this expression.

<sup>2</sup> The first grandchild of Halifax was born about this time. (See Sir William Coventry to Lord W. Savile, *Spencer MSS.* 31 [12], October 27, 1683.)

<sup>3</sup> We conjecture, Secretary Jenkins.

<sup>4</sup> Luttrell.

<sup>5</sup> Kennet (iii. 415) asserts that these meetings took place, at the house of a Major Long, in the City, 'who has often attested the truth of it.' Lord Ailesbury, in his *Memoirs*, speaks of interviews at Whitehall in the lodgings of Mistress Croft, an aged maiden lady, who had been the Duke's governess.

<sup>6</sup> The Duke of York (?).

Brussels ;' nor did he ever pardon the over-zealous 1683 official.<sup>1</sup>

[November] 9. L [Halifax ?] came from 29 [the King ?] and told me my business should be done to my mind next week, and the<sup>Q</sup> [Queen ?] was my friend and had spoken to 39 [Duke of York ?] and D [Duchess of York ?] in my behalf ; which he said 29 took very kindly, and ha'd express'd so to her. At parting he told me there should be nothing required of me but what was both safe and honorable ; but said there must be something done to blind 39.

[November] 15. L came to me with the copy of a letter I was to sign to please 39. I desired to know in whose hands it was to be deposited ; for I would have it in no hands but 29. He told me it should be so ; but if 39 ask'd a copy it could not well be refused. I referr'd myself entirely to 29's pleasure.

Of this second letter Lord Halifax, as already intimated, appears to have been the real author. The style of the Marquis is in general easy to a fault, but he obviously did not possess the dramatic faculty ; and one follows with some amusement the elegant and stilted periods which he has assigned to his illiterate client. We further remark that the professions of penitence ascribed to the Duke of Monmouth, though full, are vague in the extreme ; and that the previous understanding between father and son is entirely suppressed. The Duke of York, for whose eye the letter was really intended, is given to understand that the negotiation had *originated* with his nephew's submission.

*The Duke of Monmouth's Second Letter to King Charles II.,<sup>2</sup>*  
(composed for the purpose by the Marquis of Halifax).

• You must allow me, Sir, still to importune you, not without hopes of prevailing at last upon your generosity, so as it may get the better of your anger to me. I am half distracted, sir, with the thoughts of having offended you, and the torment it gives me is perhaps greater than your forgiving nature would know how to inflict upon the most criminal offenders. The character I lie under is too heavy for me to bear, - even death itself would be a relief to me could I have it without the aggravation of leaving the world under your displeasure. I must therefore throw myself upon your compassion, which being a virtue so agreeable to your nature, I hope your child, sir, will

<sup>1</sup> *Ailesbury Memoirs*, p. 82 : ' He was never in the king's graces ; but after that officiousness he could never bear the sight of him.'

<sup>2</sup> *Sprat. History of the Rye House Plot*, p. 139. Roberts (*Life of Monmouth*, i. 157) gives a date, for which there is no authority.

1683 not be an unfortunate instance of your denying it when 'tis implored. I confess, sir, *I have been in fault, misled, and insensibly engaged in things of which the consequence was not enough understood by me ; yet I can say I never had a criminal thought towards your Majesty. Not pretending by that to insist upon an absolute justification of myself, your Majesty will consider, that whilst I was under the apprehension of great anger and violence against me, it might easily corrupt my judgment, and by seeing things in a wrong light betray me into very fatal mistakes : but now that I have had time to recollect myself, everything like a fault towards your Majesty appeareth to me in such a reproaching, terrifying shape, that I have a remorse for it, which could it be seen, I assure myself it would move your compassion to me. I humbly beg, sir, to be admitted to your feet, and to be disposed of as you direct, not only now, but for the remainder of my life ; and though my resignation is too full to admit any reserve, your Majesty will permit mee to offer to you whether you will let pass any thing as a penalty upon me which may lay a stain upon my innocent children ? whether you will make me undergo the ignominy of a trial before you will give me your pardon ? Of what use or satisfaction can it be to you to forgive me, and yet give me the cruel punishment of hearing myself arraigned for treason against such a king and such a father ? and whether my being carried to the Tower, in case you be pleased to excuse my trial, can have any effect but an unnecessary mortification of one who, God knoweth, is already enough afflicted, and some kind of blemish, too, to my family, as well as a useless limitation of your Majesty's mercy ? Sir, I lay these things before you in the most submitting manner that is possible, with an entire resignation to what you shall determine. Neither do I imagine to receive your pardon any otherwise than by the intercession of the Duke, whom I acknowledge to have offended, and am prepared to submit myself in the humblest manner ; and therefore beg your Majesty would direct how I am to apply myself to him, and I shall do it, not as an outward form, but with all the sincerity of the world. If what I have said can move you to forget my past faults, it will be a grace I shall endeavour to deserve by all the actions of my life : and I am so sensible how ill a guide my own will hath been to me, that I am resolved for the future to put it entirely into your majesty's hands, that I may by that means never commit a fault but for want of your directions or your commands. Dear sir, be pleased to revive, by a kind answer, the most miserable, disconsolate creature now living.*

MONMOUTH.

Meanwhile and parallel, as it were, to this curious underhand treaty, a drama of more tragic intensity was developing in the light of day. The trial of Algernon Sidney had been hitherto deferred because the evidence

against him was legally insufficient, and in hopes that further testimony would become available. When this expectation proved futile, the Government, relying upon the unscrupulous partiality of the new Chief Justice (Jeffreys) to secure a conviction, determined, with equal malice and folly, to prosecute the prisoner. It thus afforded to a man of dauntless courage and intellectual vigour the very theatre which displayed these qualities to the highest advantage, and conferred political immortality upon a theorist who, despite an ability which verged upon genius, had never possessed any serious political influence. That Halifax was opposed to this course we may be assured. 'I did,' says Halifax, 'upon all occasions give him the best advice I could . . . after his condemnation for the petitioning for his pardon.'<sup>1</sup> Of Sidney's petitions one at least reached the King through the hands of the Lord Privy Seal himself, and Burnet identifies the memorial thus presented with the manly outspoken appeal in which Sidney had applied to the King for the justice denied him in court.<sup>2</sup> Nor is it possible to construe certain passages of the 'Character of a Trimmer,' composed by Halifax some twelve months later, save as embodying severe reflections upon the conduct of the presiding Judge.

Three days after the conviction of Colonel Sidney, Charles, with the reluctant consent of his brother, declared in Council his intention of extending pardon to the Duke of Monmouth on his submission. The same day, as Monmouth records,<sup>3</sup> 'L came to me from 29 and order'd me to render myself to morrow. Caution'd me to play my part to avoid questions as much as possible, and to seem absolutely converted to 39's interest: Bade me bear with some words that might seem harsh.'

That night the young Duke in person surrendered at the Secretary's office, where the Council was sitting; and there, in the presence of his father and uncle, made a full submission, with a confession —of which the value is more

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum already quoted on pp. 390, 392, 397.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, ii. 408. Ducasse appears to state that he delivered this himself possibly there were two copies. The petition is in the Record Office, if we remember rightly, with a note to the effect that it was delivered by Lord Halifax; but the exact reference is unfortunately mislaid. Miss Cartwright ('Sucharissa') gives no authority for her striking statement that Lord Sunderland had characteristically declined to present the petition in favour of his maternal uncle.

<sup>3</sup> November 24.

1683 or less doubtful.<sup>1</sup> He was then dismissed to his lodgings under the formal custody of a Sergeant-at-Arms.

The news spread rapidly and created intense excitement. Details were unknown, except by the principals; and while some persons affirmed that Monmouth had confessed the plot, others asserted that he had denied it. Reresby, who had heard rumours from 'a great man' that a mortification was in store for the Duke of York's party, questioned the Lord Privy Seal. Lord Halifax<sup>2</sup> responded that he doubted not but the Duke of Monmouth's 'admittance' (to Court) 'would have various interpretations and guesses by whose intercession chiefly it came to pass.' Reresby informed the Marquis that it was ascribed to the influence of the Duchess of Portsmouth and of Lord Sunderland, and to the intercession of the Duke of York. 'My lord' (proceeds Reresby) 'said that was a mistake, for the Duke of York and his interest had opposed it to the last; and did own that himself had chiefly laboured in it, and brought it to effect. He gave me several reasons as well public as private for his so doing, not so fit to be here mentioned. By this' (adds Sir John) 'it appeared that, notwithstanding the great interest against this lord, he reserved a great power with the King. I found by his lordship that the Duke of Monmouth had confessed the truth of the late plot to the King and Duke, but would not give any public evidence against the conspirators.' Reresby, however, was shrewd enough to lay considerable stress on the King's own inclinations, which revealed themselves in lavish caresses. The young Duke's return had, in effect, all the appearance of a triumph; and we must in fairness admit that, however dubious its ultimate issue, the immediate results fully justified the expectations of the Marquis, by inflicting a decided check upon the party of reaction and the Duke of York, its chief representative.<sup>3</sup>

That Prince acted with promptitude and vigour.

<sup>1</sup> Of this confession James has left two accounts (one in his *Life* i. 742], the reference to the other is mislaid); a third, attributed to Charles, is in Sprat's *True Account* (p. 136); but a hint conveyed in the *Lords' Journal* (xiv. 382) leads us to believe that Monmouth had been specially warned against contradicting his uncle. Since, moreover, a promise had been made that his admissions should go no farther, he had reason to acquiesce in all with which he was charged, the assassination plot only excepted.

<sup>2</sup> November 25 (*Memoirs*, p. 286; misprinted Oct.).

<sup>3</sup> See in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xv., part 1, p. 129, December 3, 1683, letter dated 'Whitehall:'. . . The Whigs pretend to get ground daily. . . We stick not to say, the King's friends, as they call them, are retrograded 15 degrees of what they were 10 days ago.'

Severe pressure was applied to the King, and two days after his submission<sup>1</sup> the Duke of Monmouth was placarded in the 'Gazette' in terms which certainly suggested that he had practically turned king's evidence. 1683

This strategy, as Ralph points out, demands our highest admiration. James was no genius, but he had effectually checkmated the ablest man of his day; since to Halifax the move was as embarrassing as to the young Duke himself.<sup>2</sup> It had been tacitly understood between the Duke of Monmouth and the Minister that any admissions which the younger man might make should remain sacred; and on the first suspicion of the publication, though his pardon had not yet passed the Seals, the Duke of Monmouth turned restive. Lord Halifax, whose design appeared threatened with immediate shipwreck, remonstrated earnestly with his client. He assured him that the publication had been wrung from the King by the importunity of his Grace's enemies, and pointed out that the bailing of the prisoners in custody, which necessarily impended (according to the provisions of the Habeas Corpus Act) within forty-eight hours of the existing date,<sup>3</sup> would exonerate the Duke from the infamous charge of treachery.<sup>4</sup> Burnet, who always insists upon the supreme importance of this matter, is strongly of opinion<sup>5</sup> that had Monmouth followed the advice of his new mentor 'it would have given a great turn to affairs.'

In the meantime Lord Halifax was transmitting to Lord Preston the following significant epistle, which in its reference to the Continental situation demands some preliminary explanation. At the moment when the siege of Vienna by the Turks<sup>6</sup> engrossed all the energies of the Empire, France had endeavoured to coerce the Escorial by occupying, in time of ostensible peace, the richest provinces of the Spanish Netherlands; arrogantly refusing meanwhile to release that substantial security unless indemnified for her pseudo-pretensions by Luxembourg or more valuable 'equivalents.'<sup>7</sup> The French faction

<sup>1</sup> Monday, November 26.

<sup>2</sup> On the 26th 'L.' told Monmouth, 'coming home,' that 'he feared 39 began to smell out 29's carriage. That - said to 39 that morning, that all that was done was but sham.'

<sup>3</sup> The end of the term being at hand.

<sup>4</sup> Because if a second witness had appeared against the prisoners they would have been remanded to prison.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist.* ii. 411, edit. 1833.

<sup>6</sup> August-October, 1683. (See *Œuvres de Louis XIV.*, iv. 263.)

<sup>7</sup> For which see Ralph, i. 810; the *Dutch Despatches* and d'Avaux, *passim*.

1683 which now predominated at the English Court regarded these unwarranted aggressions with characteristic complacency; while all demands for the succours to which Spain was entitled by treaty, all allusions to the international agreement of 1681, were contemptuously and systematically evaded by the strategy of the English Government.<sup>1</sup> In the United Provinces the pusillanimous policy of Amsterdam thwarted with similar persistence the energetic counsels of the Stadtholder.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Preston.*<sup>2</sup>

London Nov: 28 83.

My L<sup>d</sup>—If Mr. Tempest had given mee longer warning I should have enlarged my selfe more, and made the full use of so good an opportunity. I agree with your L<sup>d</sup>p by my observation, that France hath really no mind to the Warre, and will never forgive the Prince of Orange for doing that which they call forcing them into it; <sup>3</sup> And perhaps were their more secret thoughts known, As things have fallen out, they wish they had never insisted upon their pretentions in Flanders; but his Christian Ma<sup>ty</sup> is now so farre engaged, that it may bee a matter of hard digestion to go back from them. for this reason, hee took Courtray and Dixmude, in hopes to fright the confederates into a compliyanee; this not prevayling, and the Leavies in Holland being likely to go on, notwithstanding that Amsterdam will not contribute towards them, I foresee hee will attempt something even in the deep of winter which may discompose the Prince of Orange, and strengthen the opposite party, there being a necessity of using some hast in what is done, that it may have its effect, before a peace or truce bee made in Hungary, which would so mend the game of the Confederates, that France is not without reason very apprehensive of it. In case nothing of this kind shall bee attempted, or succeed if it is, then I imagine the K. of France may descend a little from the haughty methods hee hath of late made use of; and the thing I would bee informed of by your L<sup>d</sup>p in this case, is, whether by your observations of the temper of that Court, they might not be prevayled with to restore what they have taken, and to quit their groundlesse claymes in Flanders, provided it bee done at

<sup>1</sup> *Dutch Despatches*, passim.

<sup>2</sup> *Netherby MSS.* (an imperfect version will be found in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 368), in answer to Lord Preston's of <sup>October 20</sup> ~~November 5~~ (*ibid.* p. 292). Both letters were carried by a private hand that of Lord Preston's secretary. It should be remarked that Preston's letters are mainly concerned with insinuations against Dr. Burnet, then in Paris; to these Lord Halifax does not allude.

<sup>3</sup> 'They are much perplexed here in their councils about Flanders; their honour, as they think, being engaged to maintain their violence there' (Preston, as above).

our Kings importunity for the better grace, and to save the 1683  
 appearances. This would go very much against the stomach  
 of such a mighty Conqueror, and yet if the effect of doing it,  
 might bee the making Spayne and Holland lesse warm, in pur-  
 suing the interests of Germany when their own were provided  
 for, and by that means let France bee at more liberty to make  
 their party good in that part of the world, it would perhaps bee  
 no ill bargain to them. Pray let mee know your private  
 opinion whether such a thing is possible in the case above  
 mentioned. Your L<sup>d</sup>p hath I suppose had an account of the late  
 disorders in the lower end of the Gallery,<sup>1</sup> from those who have  
 more skill than I have in things of that kind ; I lament that so  
 much noise was made in the manner of it,<sup>2</sup> and wonder the  
 great men who had a part in managing that matter did not use  
 more dexterity, to have things done with tendernesse and  
 silence, and to avoid the occasion of all the undecent discourses,  
 the world is full of upon this subject, which would have lasted  
 much longer, if a new thing had not happened, that draweth  
 everybodys thoughts towards it ; it is the D. of Monmouth's  
 being received againe and pardoned. You may imagine what  
 oppositions must bee made to it before it was done, and what  
 inferences drawn from it afterwards ; things of this kind are  
 ever thought Mysteries, and deep reasons must bee assigned for  
 that which was so little expected, but I beleeve there is no more  
 than this, that Nature hath prevayled, and the Father forgot  
 what hee had committed against the King, by a distinction  
 between his naturall and his politique capacity. He hath made  
 an intire submission, and to the Duke, too, and it is to bee pre-  
 sumed, that after having recovered such a fall, hee will no more  
 put himselfe in the danger of a relapse, for which no cure can  
 reasonably bee expected. As this is sufficiently talked of here,  
 I do not doubt but reflections are made upon it at Paris ; I desire  
 therefore your nicest observation of all the discourses relating  
 to this businesse, since they may bee of great use to your selfe,  
 as well as a satisfaction to mee ; these collateral things may give  
 great lights to the main businesse, and the disturbance they  
 may receive by any considerable alteration in our Court, may  
 perhaps, in spite of their secrecy, give you a window into their  
 scheme, so that you may gather by rationall inferences, more  
 than they would ever think fit to impart to you. This may bee  
 an occasion for your L<sup>d</sup>p to talk with all your French acquaint-  
 ance round, as soon as you can, that you may have their first  
 reflections, and not give them time to consider what they should

<sup>1</sup> 'The apartments of the Duchess of Portsmouth. The 'Grand Prieur' had been dismissed the country on account of a scandal which connected him with the Duchess of Portsmouth (Burnet and other authorities ; also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 368).

<sup>2</sup> The 'Grand Prieur' had been met at the chamber door of the lady's apartments, and had been ordered to leave the kingdom within twenty-four hours (*Dutch Despatches* [Open] of November 16<sup>th</sup>, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. FF, f. 566).



1683 tell, and what they should conceal from you. My curiosity to be informed in this or any thing else is not so great, as to desire an account, except it be conveyed by a safe hand; in the mean time and ever, I am,

My dear L<sup>ds</sup>

Most faithfull humble servant

HALIFAX.

We must now pursue to its close the progress of the Monmouth affair. The expostulations of Lord Halifax were impotent to curb the Duke's impetuosity, and scarcely had his pardon passed the Seal<sup>1</sup> ere the young man was ridiculing, with the utmost imprudence, the statements of the 'Gazette.' His reckless denials, which, moreover, certainly overstepped the bounds of truth, compelled his father to assume the show at least of resentment, and the Duke received summary directions to deliver a written acknowledgment of his confession.<sup>2</sup>

Lord Halifax (says Burnet<sup>3</sup>) pressed him to write a letter to the King. . . . *Plot* was a general word, that might signify as much or little as a man pleased: they had certainly dangerous consultations among them, which might be well called plots. He said, the service he might do his friends by such a general letter, and by his gaining the king's heart upon it, would quickly balance the seeming prejudice that such a general acknowledgement would bring them under, which could do them no hurt.

The Duke eventually presented<sup>4</sup> to the Committee of Council a paper, which does not seem to be extant, but which the Cabinet found to be 'finely worded,'<sup>5</sup> and which Ralph not improbably ascribes to Halifax himself. It was pronounced, however, by no means sufficiently explicit, and a draft was eventually produced<sup>6</sup> which the King required his son to sign, on penalty of instant disgrace. The Marquis again exerted his influence; he came to the Duke of Monmouth's lodgings, and was closeted with the Duke and his wife in her apartments.<sup>7</sup> Friends were waiting in the ante-room; the Duke came out to them once or twice, and eventually admitted that Halifax had persuaded him to endorse the document in question, engaging that his Majesty should never let it be seen, and

<sup>1</sup> November 28.

<sup>2</sup> Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 656; Burnet.

<sup>3</sup> Burnet, ii. 413.

<sup>4</sup> About December 4.

<sup>5</sup> Carte's *Ormonde*.

<sup>6</sup> See it in Sprat (p. 141) and Roberts' *Life of Monmouth* (i. 172); the language is explicit, though moderate.

<sup>7</sup> Evidence of Row, Forbes, Godfrey, &c. (*Lords' Journal*, xiv. 380, &c.).

assuring the young man that now was the time to gain his father's favour. The Duke of Monmouth accordingly resigned to his father a holograph copy of the statement prepared by the Council,<sup>1</sup> but he was haunted by painful qualms lest his action should incriminate his fellows, and immediately submitted the original draft to Mr. John Hampden, who, having been just released upon bail, was still awaiting his trial. As evidence the paper was absolutely worthless, but the unwarrantable use which, during the recent trial of Sidney, had been made of irrelevant documents had created a general terror. Mr. Hampden sent word<sup>2</sup> to the Duke that he looked on the sheet as his death-warrant. Overwhelmed with horror, the Duke immediately recanted,<sup>3</sup> imploring Lord Halifax to recover the dangerous document. The King remonstrated, but on his son's reiterated importunity he at length, with great irritation, ordered Halifax to restore the paper and send the applicant to ——.<sup>4</sup> A few hours later the Vice-Chamberlain was sent to forbid him the Court; and the same day, with Stoic indifference, Algernon Sidney suffered on Tower Hill. As regards the incriminating paper, Reresby's records:

My Lord Privy Seal said to me that the manner of doing it was something hard (as it was required) but he ought to have submitted entirely to the King in it. I found his lordship was concerned (as he had reason to be, being looked upon as his friend in the matter of his admittance) that he was so obstinate. . . . I found the Duke of York was much displeased with my Lord Privy Seal, though he showed it not openly, that he was not consulted on the affair of bringing in the Duke of Monmouth; and it was my Lord Privy Seal's expression that the Duke would never forgive him.<sup>5</sup> . . .

[December 11.] It was much reported in town that my Lord Privy Seal was not well with the King upon the late affair with the Duke of Monmouth, and that he met with discouragements at Court to so great a degree as to make him leave business. My lord told me, upon my acquainting him with this, that he had met with discouragements from some, but not from the King, for he was as well there as ever; and that there would be a further production of affairs, in a little time, than was

<sup>1</sup> Ormonde in *Carte's Life*.

<sup>2</sup> December 5 (?).

<sup>3</sup> He refused to assume responsibility for the paper at Council, as had been previously arranged.

<sup>4</sup> 'This is authentic, and of my certain knowledge' (*Ailesbury Memoirs*, p. 84).

<sup>5</sup> December 6 (*Memoirs*, p. 288).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 289.

<sup>7</sup> See also *ibid.* p. 290, December 16. In a speech of 1689 Halifax asserts his belief that James had not then forgiven his lordship's share in the transaction.

1683 expected, and so pointed at the thing that I guessed what he meant. [Reresby subsequently<sup>1</sup> heard, from a third hand, how the Duke of York had complained] that if my Lord Privy Seal had no friendship for him, yet, as being the King's brother, he might have told him of the design, and not have brought in Monmouth without acquainting him with it in the least; that he could never forget the former services done by my Lord Privy Seal; but he took a method to bring it to pass were it possible, for to his knowledge he was yet labouring to reunite the King and the Duke of Monmouth. [The Marquis hereupon told Reresby] that this complaint from the Duke looked as if he had a mind to be upon better measures with him; but that he had not seen the Duke of Monmouth since he last went from Court, and that, he only acting in that affair by the King's commands, could not acquaint the Duke with it when his Majesty would not allow him to do it.

Meanwhile the motives of the Marquis were assailed from the opposite quarter. Among the Extreme Whigs—and we may instance, more especially, the case of John Hampden himself—the whole incident created the most sinister impression, and excited a frenzy of hatred which exploded, some five years later, to considerable effect. In such circles it was positively believed that the Marquis had intervened with the sole object of procuring evidence against the remaining culprits. Absurd as was the legend, it derived superficial corroboration from the course of subsequent events. Upon his breach with the Duke of Monmouth, the King—or, more properly, the Duke of York—chose to contend that the understanding by which the young Duke had been exempted from appearing against his associates was *ipso facto* rescinded; and in the exercise of somewhat sharp practice he was subpoenaed towards the end of January to give evidence against John Hampden. Upon this, and probably with his father's permission, the Duke, a second time absconding, eventually fled the country;<sup>2</sup> and when, on February 6, Mr. Hampden was brought to the bar, the Duke of Monmouth, the first witness for the Crown, was summoned in vain. The two witnesses requisite by statute in trials for high treason were not, therefore, forth-

<sup>1</sup> December 16, *ibid.* p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> Among the *Deronsire MSS.* is an anonymous letter to Henry Savile, apparently from a servant of the Duke of Monmouth, dated 'Saturday, 1 at night: 'When I saw the King he seem'd to wonder why the D: of M: should go beyond see without leve but I saw no anger in his countenance when he spoke to me. I have not yet heard anie thing from the D: of M: when I do it is lickly you will be troubl'd with another epistle from y<sup>r</sup> humble sarvent.'

coming. Mr. Hampden, on the evidence of Lord Howard, 1683  
 was consequently tried for misdemeanour, and condemned 84  
 to a fine of 40,000*l.*, which for him spelt perpetual imprisonment—at least, till the death of his father.

The time was now drawing near when at the latest, under the terms of the Triennial Act,<sup>1</sup> a Parliament was required to assemble. On January 10 Lord Halifax told Sir John Reresby—<sup>2</sup>

. . . he had been very earnest with the King for a Parliament, but to no purpose ; that he had used for arguments that, though the King had slipped his opportunity of calling one soon after the last plot, when he could not have missed of one according to his own desire, if he feared not to have a good one now, the longer it was deferred the worse it would be, till at the last it might be used as an argument never to call one at all. That nothing ought to be so dear to him as to keep his word with his people : that the law required a Parliament to be called every three years ; that his Majesty had promised upon the last dissolution to observe the laws, by a proclamation setting forth the reasons, at the same time, why he had<sup>3</sup> dissolved that Parliament ; that the general use of such proclamation was that he intended to call another within the three years, and that he feared an ill construction might be made of his not doing accordingly ; that though the anti-monarchical party was very low and discouraged, yet this might raise discontent in another party, those which were for the service of the Crown, but for his Majesty observing the laws at the same time, especially where they had his royal word for it. However, if his Majesty thought fit to do it, he would not relinquish his service, but if he could find out any reasons as an excuse for his not doing so, would study to do it.<sup>4</sup>

This last sentence Lingard stigmatises—and not, we think, without justice—as ‘very courtly.’ It is, indeed, a question whether on such a point Lord Halifax would not have enhanced his reputation by a formal retirement. The principle of Ministerial solidarity was not, of course (as Macaulay so convincingly urges), at that period accepted ; and the Marquis, moreover, knew—none better—that his resignation would have constituted in effect a long-desired triumph for the Court of France<sup>5</sup> and the

<sup>1</sup> The so-called ‘repeal’ of this statute had merely annulled the *penal* clauses by which the Act was to be enforced.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 293.

<sup>3</sup> See *ante*, p. 296, note 2.

<sup>4</sup> The concluding sentence—‘So that there seemed no possibility of a Parliament, except we were compelled to it by a foreign cause ; for if the war went on between France and Spain we continued in danger that Spain and Holland would declare war against us’ may be ascribed to either Reresby or Halifax, as inverted commas are not employed in the original.

<sup>5</sup> See *ante*, pp. 371, 375.

1683<sup>84</sup> reactionary party. But perhaps the most salient argument, in favour of official tenacity is supplied by the sudden changes to which the Court atmosphere was liable, and of which the advent was often as rapid as it was unforeseen.

The Marquis therefore, undeterred by repeated failure, pursued his attempts at reinforcing his own (or the Moderate) party. With this view he exerted himself for the release of the imprisoned Lord Danby, his animosity against whom had lessened in the course of recent developments.<sup>1</sup> The arguments of Lord Halifax perhaps determined the King, who had been already approached with this object, though from utterly different motives, by the Duke of York himself;<sup>2</sup> and, thus stimulated, Chief Justice Jeffreys took upon himself to reverse a former decision of the courts.<sup>3</sup> Aware of the impending reconciliation, Lords Rochester and Sunderland endeavoured to obstruct proceedings; but in the event, on February 12, after a preliminary imprisonment of five years, Lord Danby was released on bail. The same day Lord Danby kissed hands at Court.

My Lord Privy Seal (says Reresby<sup>4</sup>) came into the presence soon after, and the two lords saluted each other but slightly. The next day, going from the Privy Seal to wait on the Earl, my lord bid me give him his service and tell him he should have taken a more particular sort of notice of him, but that he thought it might not prove so well for his service.

The Earl, who had resolved for the present to decline business, quite endorsed this view, and by February 20<sup>5</sup> Reresby was convinced that the two statesmen understood one another.

The arrival of Lord Dartmouth from Tangier, whither he had been sent to arrange for our abandonment of that position upon economical motives, was the signal for renewed energy on the part of the rival factions at Court,<sup>6</sup> either of whom hoped to engage the returning nobleman:

<sup>1</sup> Reresby, *Memoirs*, January 30, p. 295; Lord Danby to Lord Chesterfield, January 17 (*Chesterfield's Letters*, p. 270); Chesterfield to Danby (*ibid.* p. 271); *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv., part 9, p. 439 (Charles Bertie to Lord Danby).

<sup>2</sup> Who hoped the release of Danby would impede the summons of a Parliament, since by Parliamentary authority he had been committed to the Tower. Reresby is in error on this head. France opposed the release of Danby (Dalrymple, part i., book i., pp. 129, 130; and Luttrell, i. 300).

<sup>3</sup> Hallam (edit. 1850, ii. 116, 117) does not criticise his action from the constitutional point of view.

<sup>4</sup> February 12, *Memoirs*, p. 296.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 297.

<sup>6</sup> April 15, *ibid.* p. 301.

but Lord Dartmouth declined these attentions, considering 1684 himself strong enough to stand on his own legs.<sup>1</sup>

When (says Reresby) I told this to my Lord Privy Seal, he said everybody had not wit and strength to stand alone; that it was true he had done so, which he attributed to the King's kindness to him, and his good fortune, and to some measures (especially that of not seeking his own gain or profit) which his lordship, in his circumstances,<sup>2</sup> was not so well qualified to follow, and that he had at the last this advantage by it, that he hoped ere long to find his greatest opponents court him for their friend (meaning Lords Rochester and Sunderland), for at this time it was given out that they began to disagree.

But, despite all his efforts, the star of Halifax during the early part of 1684 steadily and sensibly declined. The appointment of Godolphin as Secretary of State<sup>3</sup> was considered a triumph for the Rochester faction, to which Godolphin belonged. Lord Halifax told Reresby 'the same day that though all these interests continued adverse to him, the King was as kind to him as ever. However, it was visible he was less in business than before.'

On May 11 a fresh mortification overtook the Marquis of Halifax. Upon that day his Majesty (superseding the Admiralty Commission, on which Henry Savile had hitherto retained the seat so long an object of ambition<sup>4</sup>) declared the Royal intention of managing naval affairs in future by the advice and assistance of the Duke of York.<sup>5</sup> The arrangement, however undesirable politically, was welcomed in the service, where the Duke's application

<sup>1</sup> By April 19 (Reresby, p. 301) it was whispered that Dartmouth meant to make himself head of a third party 'in opposition to those of Halifax on one side, Rochester, Sunderland and Portsmouth on the other, as the only way to bring things to a national bottom, which was the thing he contrived, being averse to fanaticism on the one hand, and to popery and a French interest on the other.' Lord Danby was understood to approve. It thus appears that Halifax was regarded as a champion of 'fanaticism' i.e. the Dissenting interest. But in May the Duke of York obtained damages of 100,000*l.* against Dutton Colt, a former Whig M.P., who had, if the evidence be correct, abused him in the most unmeasured terms. In his swaggering talk he seems to have included Peterborough, Halifax, Jenkins, and others as 'Imps and Promoters of the Interest of that D— Popish Dog, the Duke of York' (Kennet, iii. 422).

<sup>2</sup> This merely means that Dartmouth was less wealthy, and therefore in less independent circumstances, than Halifax.

<sup>3</sup> April 2; in succession to Jenkins, superannuated.

<sup>4</sup> See the correspondence between Henry Savile and his brother given in Part II. of this chapter.

<sup>5</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 303; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 370; Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives*, 2nd series, v. 586; Evelyn; the *Ailesbury Memoirs*. In order to evade the Test Act he received no patent.

1684 and knowledge of detail were regretfully remembered.<sup>1</sup> A fortnight later, without taking the oaths, the Duke formally resumed his seat as a member of the Privy Council.

Nor were other ingredients wanting in the cup of Ministerial mortification. While in England the Duke of York appeared predominant, on the Continent, to the bitter resentment of Lord Halifax,<sup>1</sup> France stood supreme. In vain, at the close of 1683, had the Spanish Court declared war against the insolent and unscrupulous aggressor; the internal decrepitude of the kingdom prevented effectual operations; the Powers were paralysed by domestic dissensions and the active intrigues of France.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Preston.<sup>2</sup>*

London Feb. 25. 83 [1683].

My L<sup>d</sup>,—I have yours by Mr Innis,<sup>3</sup> and lost no time in obeying the first part of your directions to mee, which was to presse the payment of what is due to you.<sup>4</sup> The King seemed very sensible of it, and promised to speak effectually, which I hear since hath had a good effect, care being taken, as M<sup>r</sup> Graham your brother telleth mee, to give your L<sup>d</sup>p satisfaction in this particular, and if so, there is no occasion left of pursuing the second part of your letter, since the ground of your complaint being remooved, you will no longer entertain the thoughts of leaving your poste. I must tell you there were such frequent discourses of recalling you that I my selfe was so farre alarmed at it, as to sound the King, who I found had not the least thought of it; but I will not answer for others that they might not have it in their mind, and perhaps still keep it there; report having named your succes-sor, viz: M<sup>r</sup> Soames, who is well with those that have credit, &c., but if I mistake not, will hardly bee able with all the interest hee can make, to supplant you otherwise than by your own desire. My soune is obliged to your L<sup>d</sup>p for the favourable opinion you have of him,<sup>5</sup> and it would bee well for him, if he could deserve it. Hee hath not

<sup>1</sup> See Reresby, p. 308, September 4, 1684. The Duke of Buckingham, who at this moment had allied himself to the French party at Court, complained openly of Halifax for 'refusing to admit of private communication with the French ambassador, when he offered to bring him to his lordship, and said his power would never be considerable because he was averse to that interest.'

<sup>2</sup> *Netherby MSS.* An incomplete version will be found in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 369.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 344, dated February 15.

<sup>4</sup> Preston, in the above letter, says his great expenses will oblige him to press for a recall.

<sup>5</sup> 'It may be of importance to your lordship to have a person in this post in whom you may confide . . . if I might take the liberty of naming one to your lordship who I think is very well qualified for the affair, and

yet given evidence enough of his application to any thing, to engage him where so much is necessary; but your L<sup>ds</sup> kindnesses both to him and mee is the greater, by so much as he is lesse fit for any thing of that kind.<sup>1</sup> As to the publick affayres, this is the most criticall coniuncture that hath happened a great while; France believing the disorders in Holland will reduce the Prince of Orange to give in to their proposals, whilst the other side yet flatter themselves, the resolutions will continue of reiecting a peace upon such disadvantageous termes, as it is offered to them.<sup>2</sup> Wee go on as you left us, there appearing no change in our inclinations, which must bee so cleare to your L<sup>ty</sup> by what you observe where you are, as well as by that which you hear from hence, that it needeth not bee any further explained to you.<sup>3</sup> I will add no more at present, but that I am

My L<sup>d</sup>

Your L<sup>ds</sup> most faithfull

humble servant

HALIFAX.

At the end of May 1684, Luxembourg, the object of so many solitudes, succumbed to the French arms, and Spain, defeated and abandoned, was compelled to accept the humiliation of a twenty years' truce.<sup>4</sup>

The sentiments of Lord Halifax with regard to this ignominious catastrophe were anonymously expressed, some six months later, in the famous 'Character of a Trimmer.' But his opinions were never concealed, and the hatred which he inspired at the French Court was manifested at this very moment in a singular though trivial instance. His eldest son, a young man of some ability,<sup>5</sup> had during several years completely emancipated himself from his father's control, spending his time

who I am sure hath abilities for it, and will make them appear whenever he shall be employed, it should be my Lord Eland; I should not, as well for the King's sake as for your lordship's and his own (for both whom I have so great an honour) offer this, if I did not know that he would acquit himself every way well, and besides his other qualifications bring industry and application with him (Preston, as above).

<sup>1</sup> Lord Eland was notoriously dissolute.

<sup>2</sup> He alludes to the extremely strained relations between the Prince of Orange and the Gallican party in the Provinces headed by Amsterdam.

<sup>3</sup> This is, of course, a reference to the predominance of the French interest at the English Court.

<sup>4</sup> These events are admirably summarised in the *Œuvres de Louis XIV.*, iv. 274-282.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Preston in the passage which we have quoted above (p. 116, note 5), lays special stress on his intellectual qualifications (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 314). He was known also as a rhymster (*Scille Correspondence*, p. 278, note).



1684 principally abroad, and, as it would appear, in a course of unbridled dissipation.<sup>1</sup> In March 168<sup>3</sup><sub>4</sub>, however, through the good offices of Lady Vaughan and Henry Savile, a reconciliation took place, and Lord Halifax gave consent to his son's marriage with M<sup>lle</sup>. de Gouvernet (or de la Tour<sup>2</sup>), who, as we remember, had been proposed for him some years before by Henry Savile, and to whose attractions, personal as well as pecuniary,<sup>3</sup> the young man had now fallen a victim.<sup>4</sup>

The marriage treaty in which Henry Savile, who went to Paris for the purpose, took, it would appear, an

<sup>1</sup> Reresby, March 5, 162<sup>9</sup>; December 31, 1681 (*Memoirs*, pp. 207, 228). and Robert Spencer (brother of Dorothy Lady Sunderland) to Lord Halifax, August 14, 1683 (*Spencer MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> For full account of Lady Eland's family and her maternal ancestors, the Hervaerts, see Chester, *Westminster Abbey Registers*, pp. 234, 242, &c.

<sup>3</sup> 'Her portion,' writes Lord Eland, 'is what your Lordship desires, and her wit, and person are such, that I am confident when you come to be acquainted with her you will not repent having given your consent' (March 4, 162<sup>9</sup>, *Spencer MSS.*, 31:15). He speaks with remorse of his 'faults and follies' during the preceding two or three years, regarding which he now shares his father's opinion.

<sup>4</sup> Though Lord Eland in the event proved a very undesirable husband, it would appear that the young lady had some reason at the moment to plume herself on the conquest, since Lord Eland had been regarded as much disinclined for matrimony. See previous letters from Lord Halifax to Henry Savile, and another addressed by him to James Bertie, Lord Norreys (afterwards first Earl of Abingdon), dated November 5, 1681, and expressing, we are told, the gratitude of the writer and his family for the kind proposals which 'Sir Thomas Clergis' has brought from his lordship regarding overtures of marriage for a son and daughter of the writer: 'I did not *only* willingly, but with eagerness, embrace that which had the appearance of being so desirable and advantageous, I therefore did not defer the imparting it to my sonne, who though most concerned to catch at so inviting an opportunity is it seemeth tainted with the generall mistake of the young men of the age, that maketh them afraid of marriage as a thing they represent to themselves in the false glasse of their own fancies to bee too great a restraint upon them. Whether a little time, and the persuasion of friends may not reduce him to more reasonable thoughts, I cannot tell, but I am sure it is not to be expected that a fine, young, rich Lady, courted by all the world, should stay for his conversion, so that they remainth no more for mee to do, but with a thousand and more thanks to your lordship, wholly to lay aside the thoughts of it' (*Catalogue of the Morrison Collection*, privately printed, vol. ii. p. 225). The remainder of the letter, which alludes to a marriage proposed for Lady Anne Savile, has been already given. There had been endless negotiations for a marriage between Lord Eland and one of his plain though wealthy cousins, the Lady Cavendish. (See Reresby *Memoirs*, 1875 edition, pp. 201, 206, 216, 219, 259, 261, February 162<sup>9</sup> to October 1682.) The treaty was terminated by Halifax about October 10, 1682, in a letter to Reresby *his verbis*: 'I am to give you such thanks as are due to one that acteth not only as a kind friend but a wise one, in everything that is recommended to you. The part you lately undertook was of such a nature, both so nice in itself, and in respect of those you had to deal with, that I know very few besides yourself that are capable of handling it in such a manner; but, after this, I must tell you that, let the thing in itself be ever so advisable, the means of attaining

active part—seems to have been very protracted; <sup>1</sup> but on June 10, 1684 (N.S.), <sup>2</sup> the ceremony was concluded, <sup>3</sup> and in September the Vice-Chamberlain went over once more with a yacht <sup>4</sup> to meet the young couple and the family of the new Lady Eland, who were on the point of migrating into England. The travellers brought seventeen horses, three coaches, and an amount of personal baggage (principally clothes) which, in view of Custom House regulations, inspired the unfortunate Vice-Cham-

berlain with so much anxiety, and the parties concerned (to use no harsher term) so wonderful, the incomparable mixture of hot and cold, kind and jealous, so very extraordinary, and to me so extremely discouraging, I (who seldom have thought anything an equal price for a difficulty) cannot allow myself to pursue it any further, &c.

<sup>1</sup> The lady's mother considered the settlements insufficient, her portion being 20,000*l.* and the proposed allowance 2,000*l.* a year. Lord Preston wrote, March 18 (S.S.), to assure Lord Halifax that this complaint did not emanate from Lord Eland, whose 'Passion is so great for Madelle, de Gouvernet that he would not multiply Demands, which might put a stop to the progress of the business' (letterbook, *Spencer MSS.* and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 298*b*). Mme. de Gouvernet also suspected that the relations between father and son had been strained, and was alarmed by the detum of Halifax that, since no one could tell how a husband might turn out, he desired to retain in his own hands the power of making his daughter-in-law an additional allowance. Her letters (British Museum Add. MSS. 28,569, ff. 39-52*b*) are couched in the most extraordinary phonetic French it is possible to conceive. Lord Halifax acknowledged the kindness of Lord Preston in the following letter: *The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Preston*. London June 5 84. My L<sup>d</sup>. You will forgive me the enclosing such a packet to you, for the greater assurance at this time of having it delivered. And now I must congratulate your returne from a journey that notwithstanding all your provisions against them, must be attended with many inconveniences, and no doubt will give you the better tast of the ease and pleasure you find in your own house and family at Paris. I did not think fit to trouble you whilst you were upon the wing, but now as I shall do by the first good opportunity, I hope you will let mee hear from you at large, when any body cometh over, if you have not already done it by my brother. I ow you a great many thanks for your kindnesse to my soune, and those being added to what for my selfe, it is a kind of desperate debt, grown too big for mee, ever to think of paying it all; but I am sure I will never omitt to do every thing towards it, that is in my power, being for so many reasons My L<sup>d</sup>. Your L<sup>ds</sup> most faithful humble servant HALIFAX (from the Netherby collection, catalogued in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 376).

<sup>2</sup> *Journal du Marquis de Danjou*, i. 24 (edit. 1854, &c.). Halifax appears as 'frère ainé de Sauveuil, qui avoit été longtemps envoyé en France.'

<sup>3</sup> Lord William, second son of Lord Halifax, who passed through Paris while on a Continental tour (advised by Sir William Coventry as the best means to gain experience without compromising his father), says he has been charmingly received (July 5) 'par ma soeur, qui est une personne qu'on ne sauroit trop estimer' (*Spencer MSS.* 31. 15). She is called 'Eland's vain wife' in a contemporary lampoon (*Sauv. Correspondence*, p. 278, note), died young in 1694, and is buried in Westminster Abbey.

<sup>4</sup> *Sauv. Correspondence*, p. 303. This date should evidently be September 7, 1684. Henry Savile was dead in 1689 (*ibid.* pp. 277-281).

<sup>5</sup> On account of the persecution (the Edict of Nantes was revoked a few months later). Henry Savile seems to intimate that several of her relations were detained by orders from the Government.

1684 berlain with positive terror.<sup>1</sup> At the last moment the whole 'caravan'—with the exception of Lady Eland, her mother, Lord Eland, and Henry Savile—was detained 'by his most Christian Maj<sup>ty</sup> for reasons best known to himselfe.'<sup>2</sup> Lord Weymouth in a letter to Lord Halifax<sup>3</sup> mentions these 'traverses,' 'but y<sup>r</sup> L<sup>ty</sup>' (he adds) 'is soe accustomed to them from y<sup>e</sup> quarter, that I believe y<sup>r</sup> Philosophy disgests them very easily.' If the circumstance, however, had nothing strange for contemporaries, modern readers are surely surprised to find the 'Grand Monarque' stooping to evince by petty personal slights his distaste for an incorruptible opponent.

#### PART IV.—THE REVULSION OF 1684.

At the English Court meanwhile, about the middle of the year 1684, a strange revulsion in favour of Lord Halifax begins to attract our attention.

As a matter of fact, it would appear that the King of France, the Duke of York, and Lord Rochester, at the zenith of their respective ascendancies, had at last presumed too far upon the easy temper of King Charles II. Confident in the European predominance assured him by the twenty years' truce, Louis XIV. now discontinued the pension of the English King;<sup>4</sup> while the overbearing temper of the Heir-Presumptive and the peremptory manners of the Minster had reached a height at which, in the opinion of his Britannic Majesty, they required a decisive check. He was thus impelled, and by a double motive, to patronise Lord Halifax, the consistent opponent of the French and the High Tory interests.

The first symptoms of a change are discernible in July 1684, when, a vacancy having occurred in the Treasury Commission, Lord Rochester hoped, by obtain-

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 279: 'I send you these two enclosed lists of their goods: the first enumerating their cloaths seem'd to me so extravagant (though it be matter of fact that all have been worn) that I thought it best to enumerate their ballots 'packages' and leave it to your credit at the Custom House that their yacht may be met in the river with an order to have their goods search'd at their own houses, a very usual practice to others, and would be hard to refuse to these strangers.'

<sup>2</sup> Henry Savile to Lord Weymouth unsigned letter, dated Whitehall, September 20, *Longleat MSS.*

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (24), September 22, 1684.

<sup>4</sup> See Dalrymple, part i. book i., appendix, p. 131, and part i. book ii., appendix, pp. 7, 8; and Mazure, i. 365, 371. It had been promised for three years, which expired with April, 1684.

ing the coveted post of Lord Treasurer, to supersede the Commission entirely. Much to his disgust, however, the existing arrangement continued, while the Marquis of Halifax and Lord Keeper North,<sup>1</sup> without Lord Rochester's privity, procured the appointment of their respective relatives, Dudley North and H. F. Thynne, to seats on the board.<sup>2</sup> The incident created extraordinary excitement,<sup>3</sup> not confined to this country. Across the Channel it elicited considerable alarm,<sup>4</sup> since the triumph of Lord Halifax, which it was supposed to portend, appeared the omen of a Parliamentary Session, and possibly of a rupture between the Crowns.

Nor did the first blow remain long unseconded. About the end of August the Presidency of the Council, the dignified sinecure of the Ministry, fell vacant. Public opinion, anticipating the occasion, had presumed<sup>5</sup> that Lord Halifax would be ceremoniously sacrificed to the ambition of Seymour, who desired the Privy Seal. Far other, however, was the actual disposition. To the general astonishment, no less than to his own, Lord Rochester found himself removed from his lucrative and influential position as First Lord of the Treasury to the comparatively impotent dignity of Lord President.<sup>6</sup> His friends stood aghast at this renewed testimony to the increasing influence of his rival, who expressed the situation in a sarcastic epigram<sup>7</sup> which has become proverbial: 'He said, he had heard of many kicked down stairs,' but never before 'of any that was kicked up stairs.' Upon this engrossing topic the Marquis wrote to Sir John Reresby as follows:—'You may believe I am not displeased to see such an adversary removed from the only place that could give him power and advantage, and

<sup>1</sup> A man of comparative moderation.

Burnet, ii. 144, edit. 1833; *Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 94 (York to Rochester); *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 199. *Dutch Despatches*. Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 305 mentions a strange report that Rochester had tried to rival Halifax in the affections of the Moderates.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* v. 187 (July 29, 1684).

<sup>3</sup> Lord Preston to Lord Halifax, August 8, n.s. (letter book, *Spencer MSS.*, and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. p. 310). For other letters from Preston to Halifax, see *ibid.* pp. 299, 313, 323, April 5, September 15 (two letters), December 20, 1684.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 376, August 25.

<sup>5</sup> *Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 94. Godolphin took his place, and was succeeded in the secretaryship, which he had only held a year, by Lord Middleton, a Scotchman.

<sup>6</sup> Burnet, ii. 445. (See also Luttrell, i. 310; Bramston's *Memoirs*, pp. 168, 258.)

<sup>7</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 308, August 27.

1684 he beareth it with so little philosophy, that, if I had ill nature enough for it, there is occasion given me to triumph. You see I cannot hinder myself from imparting my satisfaction to so good a friend.'

'The wonder,' as Reresby says, 'was how the finger of my Lord Privy Seal was able to effect this against the shoulder of the Duke of York, who continued Rochester's constant friend;' and so mortified, indeed, was Lord Rochester at this unexpected reverse that he seized an opportunity, which soon offered, of effecting a dignified retreat.

In consequence of intrigues with which Lord Halifax had no concern,<sup>1</sup> it had been arranged that a vacancy should be created within the course of a few months in the government of Ireland, and during October or November 1684 Lord Rochester accepted the reversion of an appointment which he regarded as honourable exile.

This virtual disgrace, as we have already hinted, must be regarded as the prelude of a proposed Ministerial revolution which was never actually effected. It is certain that during the final months of 1684 an intrigue was in progress which involved the relegation of the Duke of York, under all the forms of respect, to provincial banishment at Holyrood; and we surmise, with little fear of error, that Lord Halifax was to replace his Royal Highness as 'chief favorite and minister,' with the promise, express or implied, of a free hand in affairs both foreign and domestic.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> They originated with Colonel Richard Talbot, an Irish Roman Catholic (afterwards Duke of Tyrconnell), and Lord Sunderland. Both desired that the military patronage, which constituted the best perquisite of the Lord-Lieutenancy, should be placed in separate hands. Talbot, of course, desired that commissions should be granted to Papists; Sunderland desired to secure the profits of the commissions for the Secretary's office; and both knew that the Duke of Ormonde would oppose the change, to which Rochester, as a new man, must perforce submit.

<sup>2</sup> As early as September <sup>1</sup>/<sub>11</sub> the Duke of Monmouth sent an agent to England who, in his cups, spoke of approaching changes in England which involved his master's restoration to favour (*d'Avaux, Négociations*, ed. Mallet, iv. 87). As early as September 20 Halifax foreshadowed to Sir John Reresby an impending revolution at Court (*Memoirs*, ed. 1875, p. 309). Burnet, who at this time returned from the Continent for a visit of a few weeks' duration, heard rumours of impending alterations; but his information upon the point was vague and inaccurate in the extreme. He ascribes the movement to Sunderland and the Duchess of Portsmouth, and adds that Lord Halifax, in conversation with the Doctor, disowned the intrigue. This, of course, merely proves that Lord Halifax, on this point, had no desire to exchange confidences with the garrulous divine. It is, moreover, certain that the Marquis, at this conjuncture, remained ostensibly in the background. He was said to be 'much indisposed' (*Dutch Despatches*, November 25), went seldom to Court, and was even credited with the intention of retiring to

Our evidence upon this head, as would be inevitable 1684  
under the circumstances, is scanty in the extreme. The matter appears to have been concerted between Charles II. on the one hand and, on the other, a coalition consisting of Lord Halifax, the Prince of Orange, and the exiled Duke of Monmouth; and it has been suggested that the Queen-Consort herself acted as a useful and unobtrusive intermediary.<sup>1</sup> The circumstance is not improbable, since while rumour attributes anti-Gallican sympathies<sup>2</sup> to Catherine of Braganza, and a natural impatience of the state of pupilage into which her husband had fallen,<sup>3</sup> there is no doubt of the friendship which she entertained for Lord Halifax,<sup>4</sup> her chancellor,<sup>5</sup> or of the rather pathetic kindness which she lavished on her husband's son.<sup>6</sup>

Leaving, however, the fields of conjecture for those of ascertained fact, we collect the following details:

I. That about the end of November 1684, the Duke of York received directions to proceed northwards during the ensuing February, ostensibly that he might preside over a session of the Scottish Parliament.<sup>7</sup>

II. That on November 10, 1684, the Duke of Monmouth left Diren,<sup>8</sup> the seat of the Prince of Orange, by whom, ever since his retreat to the Continent, he had been

the country' at the approach of spring (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 378). It is, of course, possible that Lord Sunderland and the Duchesses were initiated by his Majesty, and concurred, either from jealousy of the Duke's interest or under pressure from the King. The extraordinary and baseless story attributed to the Duchesses in Burnet (*History*, ii. 475-478), but subsequently disavowed by her, would prove, if authentic, that though ostensibly on the best terms with the Duke (Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, p. 132) she was aware at least of the schemes in his disavowal.

<sup>1</sup> Burnet, British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 109.

Burnet, edit. 1843, vol. ii. p. 444, note.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 109.

<sup>3</sup> See further on, for the correspondence maintained between them in later years. The personal fascination and assiduity of Lord Halifax, with his avowed opposition to the Duchess of Portsmouth, explain the situation; but it is curious that they should have so entirely effaced the remembrance of the very discreditable share taken by Lord Halifax in the attack of 1678. (See *ante*, p. 133.)

<sup>4</sup> He had been appointed to the post about April in this year (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 481).

<sup>5</sup> See Pepys, September 7, 1662; Welwood's extracts from the Duke's Diary, November 9, 1683; Burnet, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 109; Roberts, *Monmouth*, ii. 118, 123, 126, &c.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 378 (December 1, 1684); Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, 131 (Barillon, quoting the Duke of York himself). Fox, *History of James II.*, appendix, p. viii (Barillon, December 7, 1684); *Dutch Despatches (Open)* <sup>November 28</sup> December 3, January 20, 1684 (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, pp. 169, 172, 185). (See also Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 668.)

<sup>7</sup> Pocket book of Monmouth, British Museum. *Egerton MSS.* 1,527, f. 73.

1684 received with a distinction<sup>1</sup> which had no doubt the secret sanction of King Charles.<sup>2</sup>

III. That the Duke travelled secretly to England (where, however, his presence was suspected), that rumour averred he had seen his father,<sup>3</sup> and that he left this country on December 10.<sup>4</sup>

IV. That a correspondence existed between the Duke and Lord Halifax,<sup>5</sup> and that, as the Marquis himself informs us, the two were 'upon very good terms.'<sup>6</sup>

V. That M. d'Avaux, French Ambassador at The Hague, perceived symptoms of a desire on the King of England's part for more intimate relations with the Prince of Orange, and understood that Lord Halifax was an active party to the attempt. His suspicions derived additional strength from the fact that Citters, Dutch Ambassador to the Court of St. James, paid during the month of November 1684 a brief visit to The Hague.<sup>7</sup>

\* I arranged (says d'Avaux) that the Envoy of England [at the Hague a man devoted to the Duke of York, wrote to him on the subject, informing him that we had discovered through persons in the confidence of the duke of Monmouth, that this intrigue was managed *conduite* by Mylord Halifax, who wished to restore the Prince of Orange and the Duke of Monmouth in the good grace of the King of England, and that he had had both one and the other primed as to the course of action they should pursue. That the aim of Mylord Halifax was to remove the duke of York from the management

<sup>1</sup> See d'Avaux, iv. 34, 56, 57, 61, 117, 118, 176, 187, 209, 212, 217, 226, 235, 240, 241.

<sup>2</sup> Bannet edit. 1833, vol. ii. 416 (upon the authority of the Prince of Orange); d'Avaux, iv. 217 (on the authority of Bentinck and other friends of the Prince of Orange). (See also *ibid.* pp. 235, 242, 282.) For the *officiu* remonstrances of Charles, see d'Avaux, *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> So Carte and Barillon. The *Dutch Despatches* of December 5, mention a rumour to this effect (Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, p. 170). (See also d'Avaux, iv. 187, 217.) Monmouth denied it to Grey (*Secret History*, p. 83), but may have been sworn to secrecy. For further rumours, see Dalrymple, part i., book i., appendix, p. 119; Welwood, *passim*; Roberts, i. 178-180.

<sup>4</sup> The Duke's pocket-book, as above.

<sup>5</sup> Diary of the Duke of Monmouth in Welwood, p. 376.

<sup>6</sup> Speech of Lord Halifax, made in 1689 before the 'Murder' Committee, upon the evidence of Mr. John Hampden, given fully in chapter xii.

<sup>7</sup> D'Avaux, *Négociations*, iv. 106 (September) and 183 (November). 'The Ambassador of the States-General in England came to the Hague; I discovered that it was to reconcile the Prince of Orange with the King of England. . . . I believed that Mylord Halifax had some part in this affair, since he had explained to Mr. Chudleigh that if the Prince of Orange would but believe him, he would submit to the king of England, and that thus he would easily reconcile himself to the king.' Van Beuning entered eagerly into the affair. (See also pp. 138-140.) Van Beuning's correspondence with England was principally conducted through Lord Halifax (d'Avaux, iv. 272).

<sup>8</sup> D'Avaux, iv. 140-142, November 11, 1684. (See also Dalrymple, part i., book i., p. 131 [Barillon, January 8, 1684].)

of affairs; to procure the dismissal of Mylord Rochester;<sup>1</sup> to 1684 introduce the Prince of Orange into the management of business, and acting always in concert with him, to become first Minister; and I had the king of England warned, that, unless he should solemnly repudiate a negociation which was being openly conducted at the Hague in his name, it was certain that the world would remain under its present delusion, which must be very harmful.<sup>2</sup>

M. d'Avaux originally maintained that the Prince had at first received these overtures with coldness,<sup>3</sup> but subsequently avowed his conviction that the Prince had written to one of the King of England's Ministers (Lord Halifax, as d'Avaux presumed), promising a confidential communication should be entrusted to the returning Citters;<sup>4</sup> that such a confidential message was actually sent,<sup>5</sup> though d'Avaux doubted whether the tenor were altogether cordial. The Frenchman also notes that certain insults which had been offered to an English Ambassador at Madrid were at this time condoned, and, as d'Avaux supposed, at the instance of 'Mylord Halifax and the other friends of the Prince of Orange';<sup>6</sup> and in the last allusion to this matter<sup>7</sup> which his papers contain he quotes the opinion of persons whose information upon English affairs was regarded as reliable, 'that M. de Monmouth does his best to recommend the Prince of Orange to the King of England, and that the friends of M. de Monmouth do not despair of success.' Rumour even affirmed that the Prince designed a visit to England so soon as the Duke of York should have left for Scotland.<sup>8</sup>

VI. Nor is it open to doubt that great alarm was excited, both at Versailles<sup>9</sup> and at Amsterdam,<sup>10</sup> by the report of an impending transformation, and that Louis XIV. at once took measures to revive his waning influence at the Court of St. James.<sup>11</sup>

VII. The characters, aspirations, and circumstances of

<sup>1</sup> D'Avaux, iv. 176, December 1, 1684; 'The creatures of the Prince of Orange drew advantage from the Vice-royalty of Ireland given to Lord Rochester: they maintained that it was a pretext to remove him from business, and that Mylord Halifax would become the more important.'

<sup>2</sup> See also *ibid.* pp. 184, 185, 187.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 143, November 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 186, December 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 189, December 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 187.

*Ibid.* p. 263, February 1.

<sup>7</sup> Mazure (quoting Barillon, who quotes Chudleigh, English representative at The Hague), i. 371.

<sup>8</sup> York had pointed out to Louis that the differences between the Kings were improved by Halifax and the enemies of France.

<sup>9</sup> D'Avaux, iv. 183-185, December 1.

<sup>10</sup> Mazure, i. 371. A commercial injury inflicted on English seamen was promptly repaired, a compliment was paid to the Duchess of Portsmouth, and the arrears of the pension were settled (p. 372) at least, to some extent; but Mazure (see p. 398) is not consistent on this point.



1684 the supposed contracting parties afford, moreover, nothing which can negative the likelihood of a coalition such as was surmised. In every case, indeed, we detect very adequate motives for the course they were understood to pursue. The impulse by which Charles was actuated has been already analysed. To the Marquis the suggested combination meant the embodiment of a long postponed policy. To the Prince of Orange—mortified beyond measure by the triumph of French ambition, and thwarted at every turn by the Gallican party in the Provinces, with whom his relations had been strained to the point of absolute rupture—the alliance of Charles II. appeared valuable, even beyond its wont.

The co-operation of the Duke of Monmouth, again, forms an integral part of the scheme. To the young Duke it promised return from involuntary exile; while his father, who clung to him with an affection which Lord Halifax has described as ‘extravagant,’<sup>1</sup> was no doubt additionally reconciled to the departure of his brother by the sense that it must facilitate the presence of his favourite son. The Prince of Orange saw all the desirability of securing in his own interest the services of a possible rival,<sup>2</sup> while the Marquis had already evinced a readiness to avail himself of the influence which centred, if we may use the word, upon the person of the youthful favourite.

The consciousness of impending triumph now contributed its share to the peculiar audacity which at this epoch characterised the relations between the Marquis and the Duke of York. We find Lord Halifax opposing an abrogation of the Recusancy laws advocated by the Duke’s dependant, the hope of the more profligate Tories, the notorious Chief Justice Jeffreys,<sup>3</sup> and vigorously attacking the creation of a Roman Catholic army in Ireland.<sup>4</sup> His sarcasms upon Popish credulity became

<sup>1</sup> Reflections on Sir J. Forbes’ evidence, 1689, in chap. xiv. *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> It is certain that at this period the Duke of Monmouth had resigned all thoughts of the crown. His attempt in 1685 was entirely due to the remonstrances of others. (See Roberts, i. 186–190.)

<sup>3</sup> See the *Lives of the Norths* (i. 307–310–127 Bohn’s edit.). Lord Keeper North, a formal lawyer, of the *Jure Divino* school, had little sympathy with Lord Halifax (*ibid.* p. 318; but see pp. 300, 303, 307). But in October 1684 we trace an approximation, in all probability due to a common hatred of Jeffreys. Nevertheless, North complained that Halifax had deserted him when opposing Jeffreys on this point. Von Ranke (v. 263) corrects this statement. Halifax acquiesced in the release of such ‘Popish Plot’ prisoners as were notoriously innocent, but protested against the abrogation of the recusancy laws without consent of Parliament. The extreme Whigs seem to have owed Halifax a grudge for preventing a proclamation so calculated to create a ferment in the nation (*ibid.* p. 285).

<sup>4</sup> Colonel Maccarty, a Papist connection of Lord Halifax, was the first

additionally poignant, and were ostentatiously repeated in 1684 presence of the Duke himself.<sup>1</sup>

Yet more suggestive was a remarkable incident which has attracted the attention of historians.<sup>2</sup> The Charters of New England had been recently revoked, and about the end

proposed for a commission. The King in speech with Halifax dilated on his services. The Marquis observed that these might be repaid by a pension, and inquired whether his Majesty considered that the adoption of the proposed scheme would be a governing in accordance with law. The King responded that the laws of Iceland had less obligatory force than the laws of England. Lord Halifax offered to argue the question with any that should assert that principle, reminded his Majesty that the army had been raised by a Protestant Parliament to support a Protestant interest, and asked whether his Majesty desired to create an impression that where his hands were not tied he would show all possible favour to the Papists. The King retorted that he cared little what people said or would say; to which the Marquis returned that while it was a just piece of greatness in the King not to mind what his *enemies* said, his lordship trusted he would never despise what his friends said, especially when they seemed to have reason on their side. These remarks were repeated to Macarty by Charles himself, and the remonstrance of the irate soldier convinced Lord Halifax, if proof were still needed, of the slender reliance which could be placed upon Royal discretion (Burnet, ii. 460, edit. 1833, on the authority of Halifax himself. Burnet was in England from October to December 1684: *History*; British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584; *Dict. of Nat. Biography* i.).

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Burnet maintains (*Harleian MSS.* 6,584, r.111) that Halifax 'at this time discovered y<sup>e</sup> Kings Inclinations to Popery so plainly y<sup>t</sup> I saw he was in great apprehension.' This assertion derives strength from a passage in the statesman's *Character of Charles II.*, section 1. Burnet also declares that he himself warned Halifax at this moment of a rumour current in Paris relative to the presumed approaching secession of Charles to the Roman Church. This report, as Burnet believes, originated from the patronage accorded by Charles to a French missionary of the Roman faith newly returned from Siam. The priest, so Burnet tells us, received instruction to attempt the conversion of Lord Halifax. He called upon the Minister, who subsequently told Burnet he appeared so vain and weak a man that none could be converted by him but such as were already weary of their religion, and wanted only a pretence to throw it off. As an instance, the Marquis adduced that to the question why, since the King of Siam was represented as so favourable, the Papists had not effected his conversion, the missionary responded that his Majesty had demanded the performance of miracles as a preliminary, and that the head of the mission had been *asse-harh* as to attempt by prayer the cure of a palsy which affected the royal limbs. A few prayers seemed to effect a salutary change. Hereupon the bishop had astutely observed that his Majesty must meet God half-way, while the King required the completion of the miracle as a prelude to the formal recantation. 'Upon which lord Halifax said, since the king was such an infidel, they ought to have prayed the palsy into his arm again, as well as they prayed it out; otherwise, here was a miracle lost on an obstinate infidel: And if the palsy had immediately returned into his arm, that would perhaps have given him a full conviction.' The priest was naturally disconcerted, and the Minister repeated the story with an air of contempt, not only to the King, but to the Duke himself in presence of the King and a large company. The Duke could not conceal his vexation (Burnet, *History*, ii. 461, 462, and *Harleian MSS.* 6,845).

<sup>2</sup> See Barillon's despatch of December 7 (appendix to Fox's *James II.*, p. viii). The English version is at p. 1 of the translation published in 1808. (See also the comments of Macaulay, Fox, Von Ranke, &c.)

1684 of November 1684 the question of a fresh Constitution for the colonies concerned came under discussion at the Cabinet Council. It was debated whether provincial assemblies should be established, or whether arbitrary powers should be vested in a Governor and Council, subject to orders from the home Government.

'The Marquis of Halifax' (writes M. Barillon, who had received by despatch dated December 1 fresh instructions to press for the disgrace of the Minister) 'took upon him to contend with great warmth, that there could be no doubt whatever but that the same laws, which are in force in England, should also be established in a country inhabited by Englishmen.' On this he enlarged very much and omitted no argument by which it could be proved, that an absolute government is neither so happy nor so safe, as that which is tempered by laws, and which sets bounds to the authority of the prince. He exaggerated the inconveniences of a sovereign power and plainly declared that he could not make up his mind to live under a King, who should have it in his power to take, when ever he thought proper, the money he has in his pocket. The speech was strongly opposed by all the other Ministers, and in especial by Lord Jeffreys, who maintained with characteristic effrontery that 'whoso capitulateth, rebelleth;' <sup>2</sup> meaning that the attempt to define, after any fashion, the function of the Sovereign is equivalent to revolt. In the event, as Barillon tells us, 'it was determined not to subject the Governor and Council to convoke general assemblies of the people, for the purpose of laying on taxes, and regulating other matters of importance.' The Ambassador adds that his Royal Highness made use of the episode (which Barillon himself dismissed as relatively unimportant) in order to convince his brother of the 'inconsistency and danger' involved in employing one so much opposed to the interest of monarchy as Lord Halifax. The French Court rose to the occasion. '*Les raisonnemens du S<sup>r</sup> Halifax*,' returned Louis, <sup>3</sup> '*sur la manière de gouverner la Nouvelle*

<sup>1</sup> In this connection it is interesting to observe that both Penn and Baltimore, in their disputes concerning Maryland, referred to Lord Halifax. (See Penn's *Life*.) Penn himself had returned to England a month earlier (Dixon's *Penn*, p. 282).

<sup>2</sup> We have this detail on the authority of Lord Halifax himself (Devonshire House 'note book': under the heading 'Jeffreys L<sup>d</sup>'), 'upon occasion of Gov<sup>r</sup> to be settled in New England, I arguing for the liberty of the people, hee replyed whosoever capitulateth, rebelleth. This at the Cabinet Council.'

<sup>3</sup> Barillon, in Fox, December 13, p. ix; translation, p. 3. A note on p. ix, drawn from Barillon's despatch of December 21, shows that

Angleterre ne meritent guères la confiance que le Roy 1684  
d'Angleterre a en luy, et je ne suis pas surpris d'apprendre que le Duc d'York en ayt bien fait remarquer les conséquences au Roy son frère.'

'Nor can we fail to trace a connection between the supposed impending revolution and the appearance, *in manuscript form*, of the first and most celebrated among the tracts which we owe to Lord Halifax. The authorship of the 'Character of a Trimmer' has been regarded, even in recent years, as a more or less open question; <sup>1</sup> but evidence which was summarised by the present writer in the 'Historical Review' for October 1896, and which is given at large in the preface to the reprint of the treatise, included in the present work, enables us to state with confidence that it was composed by the Marquis of Halifax towards the close of the year 1681, and circulated anonymously in manuscript during the ensuing months. The exciting cause may be identified with a violent political diatribe which appeared upon December 4, 1681, in L'Estrange's 'Observator,' <sup>2</sup> wherein, under a current nickname and from the rabid Tory standpoint, the policy of moderation <sup>3</sup> is satirised with all the flippant virulence of which L'Estrange was a master. But the intention of the pamphlet, was far more serious than could be expected from so ephemeral an occasion, since it constitutes, as we are prepared to argue, the sketch of a political programme primarily intended for the royal eye.<sup>4</sup>

Charles showed his usual duplicity in the matter. The Duchess of Portsmouth assured the Ambassador that the disgrace of the Minister had been determined, and that his Majesty merely delayed till the Marquis should have afforded some further pretext for dismissal; but there was no reason to fear such a change in the attitude of Lord Halifax as should conciliate his Majesty's favour. Baildon hereupon represented the dangers of delay.

<sup>1</sup> See the article on Sir William Coventry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>2</sup> See introduction to the tract.

<sup>3</sup> It must be clearly noted that the article was not designed as an attack on Halifax himself, who, as the champion of an anti-Exclusion policy, is mentioned by the *Observator* with uniform respect. (See also a curious passage in the Ailesbury *Memoirs*, pp. 94, 95.)

<sup>4</sup> That a copy was sent anonymously to the King we may very fairly conclude. Sir William Coventry, with the reticence which Government interference with postal communications made a feature of seventeenth-century correspondence, hints at the super-eminence of the personages to whom transcripts had been addressed. (See his letter printed in the introduction to the tract.) *Saviliana* describes it as conveying 'under a seeming trifle the best Counsel that could be given to the King and to the well-meaning part of the Nation.' Such an interpretation again explains the author's neglect to procure a more extended publication: though the fact that L'Estrange was licenser of the press may be regarded as a yet more cogent argument. A close study of the work, moreover, reveals its real character as a remonstrance *ad hominem* - or, rather, *ad regem*.

1684 In motive therefore, though not in aim, it may be compared to Bolingbroke's 'Patriot King.'<sup>1</sup>

This aspect of the work detracts to some extent from its value as a personal revelation. The arguments employed, the sentiments expressed, are tinged with the courtly rhetoric appropriate to a Royal ear. If we compare a remarkable passage on the relative merits of monarchic and republican constitutions, with the parallel argument in the 'Rough Draught of a New Model at Sea,' the rhetorical turn of the first, the cogent and forcible reasoning of the second, appear no less significant than the practical identity of the conclusions in favour of a limited monarchy. We observe, moreover, that while the theoretic preference of the author for republican institutions is in the one case merely inferred, in the second it is developed with sarcastic emphasis. Again, the panegyric upon King Charles II., with which the 'Trimmer' concludes, affords an amusing contrast to the portrait of that monarch recorded by the Marquis of Halifax for his own satisfaction and after the Sovereign's decease. In both, no doubt, the same features are suggested: but in the 'Trimmer's' representation the colouring is laid on with a pencil judiciously liberal.

On the other hand, it is equally obvious that from the occasional point of view, which we have now for the first time recovered, the work gains enormously, both as regards significance and coherence. The attack upon pamphleteers of the 'Observator' type, with which it opens, falls into its place when we realise that the 'Character' is in itself a retort. The invective against judicial profligacy becomes no longer irrelevant when connected with a date, subsequent by only a year to the appointment of Jeffreys as Chief Justice, and to the trial of Algernon Sidney. The reiterated reflection upon the holders of reversionary rights appears fraught with peculiar energy, if we realise the predominance asserted at the moment by the Duke of York; and the 'Grand Monarque' can be easily identified with the ideal tyrant of the statesman's detestation. The reference to the Triennial Act becomes doubly interesting when the recent remonstrances of our author are recalled. We peruse with awakened curiosity the prophecy of a political judgment looming, though not apparent; nor can we fail to recognise, in the members

<sup>1</sup> It may be taken for granted that Bolingbroke was (perhaps unconsciously) inspired by reminiscences of the earlier tract; the resemblances can hardly be accidental.

of the governing group, the politicians who, through 16<sup>3</sup> guilt or interest, fear 'to throw themselves upon their country.' And to conclude, well indeed had it been for King James II. had he digested the remarkable passage which warned him that '*There is a soul in the great body of the people.*'

It is, however, as the embodiment of a policy that we are here mainly concerned with the pamphlet under discussion. As regards the religious question, we see that while Halifax *strenuously upheld the principles of the Test Act and the exclusion of Papists from political life*, while he condemned with equal vigour *any attempt to abrogate by proclamation the so-called penal statutes*, he had now withdrawn his assent from the Popish Plot revelations, and deprecated the violent policy to which they had given rise; that in relation to both Papist and Protestant Dissenters he favoured the mildest possible construction of the existing Recusancy laws, anticipating their eventual repeal by statute and a Parliamentary toleration. The section which relates to Foreign Affairs is, however, from our point of view perhaps the most important. We mark with keen appreciation its attitude of uncompromising hostility to the progress of French ambition; its daring allusions to the Dover Treaty; its bold and statesmanlike strictures upon the foreign policy which had been pursued by the Administration in despite of the Marquis during the three preceding years; and the urgency, the almost despairing urgency, with which it advocates a return to the principles of the Triple Alliance. The author deprecates indeed the impression that he would sacrifice the domestic interests of England to the exigencies of Continental policy; but he suggests the possibility of a *via media* between the extremes of bravado and subservience. The topic evokes, in fact, the one note of passion whose vibrations disturb the serene intellectual atmosphere of the Halifax pamphlets; and in an access of indignant patriotism the Minister protests that when he beholds the 'Roses blasted and discoloured while the Lilies triumph and grow insolent upon the comparison, when he considereth our own once flourishing Laurel now withered and dying and nothing left us but the remembrance of a better part in History than we shall make for the next age,' he is 'tempted to go out of the world like a Roman philosopher, rather than endure the burden of life under such a discouraging prospect.'

On the literary merits of this remarkable essay it is

needless that we should dilate. It exhibits in a consummate degree the characteristics of its author's style—a style pure, vivid, colloquial; chequered perhaps by a gentlemanly carelessness in the construction of the sentences, but not unfrequently rising to a strain of unpremeditated eloquence; the style, in a word, of an orator and of a man of the world. If it lacks the varied vocabulary of the author's favourite Montaigne,<sup>1</sup> it shares his racy vigour, his abhorrence of the pedantic and the formal,<sup>2</sup> his return to those familiar idioms of common life which the Frenchman so admirably describes as the 'subsoil of the language.' In wealth of witty allusion a wit seldom defaced by the indecency so characteristic of Montaigne's own pages—the Englishman excels; and the father of the modern essay cannot compare with his disciple in the art of a penetrating, yet delicate irony. Nor will the student of Dean Church's fascinating article fail to trace, in the genius of the two writers, analogies more significant and extensive than are afforded by similitude of style. In both we perceive a mind singularly open, curiously devoid of the passion for system. Of both it might be said that they pierced through appearance to the very substance of things, and owed to this contact their justice, moderation, good sense, and practical insight. Still deeper considerations are suggested by Mr. Maurice in a passage of his 'Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy,'<sup>3</sup> which is not among the least valuable portions of that strangely suggestive work. The peculiarities of Montaigne's intelligence are identified with the characteristics of the modern scientific spirit: and it is regarded as natural and impressive that he should have been more early appreciated by the countrymen of Bacon than by his own. In politics Montaigne ranked as a Trimmer.<sup>4</sup> Macaulay has involved both in the charge of voluptuousness,<sup>5</sup> which in the case of Halifax at least it is impossible to maintain; and the accusation of atheism has been preferred against both, perhaps with equal inaccuracy.

Despite its limited circulation the essay, on its original

<sup>1</sup> 'the book in the world I am the best entertained with' (letter to Cotton, in the *Works*).

<sup>2</sup> Montaigne is described by Halifax himself as 'a great man, whom nature hath made too big to confine himself to the exactness of a studied style. . . . He scorned affected periods, or to please the mistaken reader with an empty chime of words' (*ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> Edition 1872, vol. ii. p. 150.

<sup>4</sup> *Essays*, ed. 1659, iii. 391.

<sup>5</sup> *History*, edit. 1858, ii. 421.

appearance, attracted considerable attention.<sup>1</sup> Speculation was rife as to the authorship,<sup>2</sup> which was very generally ascribed to Sir William Coventry;<sup>3</sup> and though the latter, in answer to inquiries, denied the flattering impeachment,<sup>4</sup> it was under his name that the pamphlet three years later issued from the press of an enterprising publisher.<sup>5</sup> An answer was immediately forthcoming, which, though originally anonymous, is included in the 'Works' of Lord Mulgrave,<sup>6</sup> subsequently Duke of Buckinghamshire.

Meanwhile to these masked assaults on the heart of the enemy's position Lord Halifax continued to add more direct, although cautious, manœuvres. An active correspondence existed between himself and the Duke of Monmouth, who, having returned to The Hague, was living with the Prince of Orange upon terms of ostentatious cordiality.

Jan 5. (writes Monmouth in his diary<sup>7</sup>) I received a letter from L [Halifax?] marked by 29 [the King?] in the margin, to trust entirely in 10; and that in February I should have leave to return. That matters were concerting towards it; and that 39 [the Duke of York?] had no suspicion, notwithstanding of my reception here.

Feb. 3. A letter from, L [Halifax?] that my business was almost as well as done; but must be so sudden, as not to leave room for 39's [the Duke's?] party to counterplot. That it is probable he would choose Scotland rather than Flanders or this country; which was all one to 29 [the King?].

At the same time, with a view no doubt of yet further strengthening his position, the Marquis had obtained, at the King's hand, a searching investigation of the frauds in the Hearth-money department, to which so much reference has already been made. A very careful examination of the books by competent officials elicited the fact that the accounts had been falsified.<sup>8</sup> But it would seem that the incriminated persons, in desperation, contrived to remove the compromising pages.<sup>9</sup> They appear to have admitted

<sup>1</sup> Better of Sir William Coventry, given in the introduction to the tract.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> See introduction to tract.

<sup>6</sup> Under the absurd date 1679.

<sup>7</sup> Welwood, p. 376.

<sup>8</sup> See North's *Life of Dudley North* (who detected the forgeries), ii. 203, Jessopp's edition (Bohn).

<sup>9</sup> Burnet; Luttrell (January 24 and February 1); *Letters of Lady Russell* (7th edit. 1809), January 31, p. 56. 'It appears that Kingdon and Trant,



1684<sup>85</sup> the existence of accomplices, and Lord Halifax insisted that the King should himself examine the mutilated volumes.<sup>1</sup>

Monday, February 2,<sup>2</sup> was the day prefixed, and rumour asserted that Rochester would prove an accomplice, and might even find himself committed to the Tower.<sup>3</sup>

But a strange reverse of fortune was in store for all the parties concerned. On the morning of Monday, February 2, the King fell suddenly ill with the symptoms of an apoplectic seizure. At first he rallied, and hopes were entertained of his recovery.<sup>4</sup> About midnight, however, on Wednesday the 4th, his condition appeared ominous<sup>5</sup> in the extreme. The Queen—who, overcome with distress and fatigue, had been compelled to retire—sent Lord Halifax, her Chancellor,<sup>6</sup> to her husband, ‘with protestations of her heartfelt and painful grief at the melancholy and heavy blow, very humbly imploring his pardon for anything in which she might have displeased him.’ The Marquis discharged his errand ‘with very great eloquence. . . . Whereto the king answered with some trouble, that’ (the message) ‘was very acceptable to him,

Bridges and another were the offenders, and offered 40,000*l.* for atonement (*ibid.* p. 56; *Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 332; Bramston, p. 171). Extraordinary to relate, all three were provided for in the Irish Revenue (*Clarendon Correspondence*, i. 324, 331, &c.; *Life of Petty*).

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Lord Halifax, evidently to his cousin, Mr. Henry Frederic Thynne (afterwards the second Lord Weymouth), Clerk of the Council (*Loughleat MSS.*): ‘For Mr. Thynne. Munday afternoon. I am sorry you have the excuse of the gout, for your absence today at the board; as to the other particulars, I will remember them, but

the mean time thinke it is not at all unreasonable to suspend the payments to Mr. Auditor, till the businesse is cleared concerning the books. I should not bee unwilling to receive the proposall for an annuity, but that for the present, I cannot think of a fitting security for so small a one; and I will not offer (though others in the same case have accepted it) such a kind of bond as shall engage mee and my heires to the payment of it, till a security of land shall bee given which in a little time I suppose I shall bee able to provide. Yours, HALIFAX.’

<sup>2</sup> *Dutch Despatches*. The affair is mentioned January 27 and January 30  
February 6 and February 9  
(British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, pp. 186, 188).

<sup>3</sup> The *Dutch Despatches* mention that ‘persons of distinction’ were suspected. The Burnet MS. (British Museum) specifically mentions Rochester.

<sup>4</sup> See Kennet, iii. 423. One of the best extant accounts is that of Lord Ailesbury (*Memoirs*, pp. 87-93). He was at the time Gentleman of the Bedchamber. (See also *Hatton Correspondence*, ii. 51-54.) The Duke of Newcastle on February 6 thanks Halifax for news of the King’s recovery.

<sup>5</sup> *Dutch Despatches* of February 6.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* In the account given years afterwards by James II. and his wife to the nuns of Chaillot, *Feversham* is erroneously mentioned. He was the Queen’s Chamberlain.

but that it was not for her to ask his pardon, but rather for him to ask hers; and as he did that from his heart, so he prayed her Majesty to display patience, and bear this severe blow with fortitude.' Thirty-six hours later—about noon on February 6—and after the strange reconciliation with Rome, which the Marquis certainly suspected,<sup>1</sup> Charles II. expired. 16<sup>8</sup>

The Duke of York, upon his brother's illness, had immediately stopped the ports, no doubt apprehending the possibility of Monmouth's unbidden return. It was the Marquis, on the other hand, who first despatched to the exile the tidings of his father's death.<sup>2</sup> 'O cruel fate!' runs the record in the diary of the disconsolate Monmouth; and the words might as fitly represent the sensations of his Grace's mentor. For Charles himself, indeed, the Marquis can have entertained but a tepid, half-cynical affection, as the subtle 'Character'<sup>3</sup> he has left us sufficiently testifies. A slight though brilliant specimen of intellectual analysis, it differs from other contemporary portraits in that it is neither a eulogy nor a libel, and its cool dispassionate estimate bears on its surface the stamp of an almost scientific impartiality. But the great revolution which the Minister had contemplated centred, and centred exclusively, round the person of the departed monarch.<sup>4</sup> From a Ministerial point of view four days had sufficed to obliterate the importance of the Marquis and annihilate his prospects. 'My Lord Rochester,' says a private letter written on February 10, 'is the premier minister now, and the discourse of his lo<sup>p</sup> going into Ireland is at an end.'<sup>5</sup> In effect, Lord Rochester by permission transferred to his elder brother that lucrative if invidious appointment, himself at last obtaining the prize of his ambition, the Lord Treasurer's staff.

<sup>1</sup> 'Those who saw him upon his Deathbed, saw a great deal' (*Character of Charles II.*).

<sup>2</sup> 'The sad news of his death by L,' records Monmouth, February 16 (Welwood).

<sup>3</sup> Printed in the Works.

<sup>4</sup> It is scarcely necessary here to touch upon the rumour that Charles had been poisoned in order to prevent the anticipated change. (See Oldmixon, &c.)

<sup>5</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 28,569, p. 54. It has, we believe, been printed. (See also Ailesbury's *Memoirs*, p. 98.)

## APPENDICES TO CHAPTER IX.

## I.

*The accusation of subornation brought against Halifax in the case of Lord Shaftesbury, 1681 (see ante, p. 301).*

It seems clear from Wilkinson's narrative (Christie, ii. 419) and from Burnet ('Hist.,' edit. 1833, ii. 293) that the Solicitors to the Treasury, men of doubtful character, were not scrupulous in their attempts to gain evidence against the prisoner. The violence of party feeling accused Halifax as the principal in this attempt.<sup>1</sup> This charge was no doubt founded on the known antipathy between the parties, and on the fact that a man named Booth—who had offered a pension to Captain Wilkinson, a friend of Shaftesbury, if he would turn King's evidence—had 'renewed his promise' in the names of Halifax and Hyde.<sup>2</sup> In relation to this affair we may quote the following memorandum, in a peculiar hand, which was found among the Devonshire House manuscripts of the year 1689; it is endorsed by Lord Halifax 'Mr. Booth concerning Wilkinson.' (The 'Committee' is probably the Committee of Examinations or 'Murder' Committee of 1689.) 'Mr. Booth<sup>3</sup> having denied before the Com<sup>tee</sup> that he profer'd any security to M<sup>r</sup> Wilkinson for the money w<sup>ch</sup> he was to have if he would swear against my L<sup>d</sup> Shaftesbury but only that He should have the King's word for it, afterwards being confronted by Wilkinson (who affirmed he<sup>4</sup> had promised that my L<sup>d</sup> H<sup>is</sup> and my L<sup>d</sup> H<sup>is</sup> should be bound for the payment of it) he could not be positive whether he had said so or no. upon w<sup>ch</sup> I asked him (upon the stairs going down) how He could affirm it positively first that he had offer'd no security but the King's word, and afterwards be doubtfull especially since he [admitted?] I believe he had never spoke w<sup>th</sup> any of those Lords, upon w<sup>ch</sup> He said, no Truly not He nor knew nothing of them, or words to that effect.'

No attention need be paid to this sordid accusation, the natural offspring of party malignity. 'Lord Halifax,' says Burnet, ' . . . always expressed an abhorrence of such practices to me.'

## II.

For the curious Commission to manage the ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown—issued to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and Lords Radnor, Hyde, Seymour, and

<sup>1</sup> 'Lord Halifax was thought deep in it' (Burnet). (See also Ralph, i. 638. note, quoting from *The New Protestant Plot*.) Sir Thomas Thynne, in a letter of August 7, 1681, refers to these accusations: 'When you are ye principall, I may very well bee an accessory in subornation.'

<sup>2</sup> Ralph, i. 639, quoting Wilkinson's own narrative.

<sup>3</sup> The agent in the attempt upon Wilkinson and a man of very disreputable character.

<sup>4</sup> Booth.

<sup>5</sup> Halifax (?).

<sup>6</sup> Hyde (?).

*Halifax*—see Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. vii. 496 (August 24, 1681) and Oldmixon, ii. 667. It created some jealousy, the name recalling that of the ‘Ecclesiastical Commission.’ Reresby (‘Memoirs,’ p. 219) spoke on the subject to Halifax, who ridiculed the ‘malice’ of such aspersions. In the Bodleian (Tanner MSS. xxvi. 139) will be found a letter to Halifax in his capacity as Commissioner. The Commission was dissolved in October 1684 (‘Dutch Despatches [Open],’ October 1<sup>3</sup> of that year).

For a form of Popish forfeitures which Lord Halifax is said to have opposed, see ‘Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.’ xi., part 4, p. 172 (November 7, 1681).

*The Marquis of Halifax to (Sir Thomas Thynne)  
Viscount Weymouth.<sup>1</sup>*

London Nov : 29. 84.

My Ld.—My endeavours should not have been wanting to have secured Mr. Repington if hee had been in danger, but S<sup>r</sup> Andrew Hacket is pricked, and with such circumstances, that I think hee will hardly prevayle to bee released, though for some years past his importunity succeeded.<sup>2</sup> I am sorry your Ldp hath disappointed us of the hopes of seeing you here this winter, I can hardly forgive Longleat for ingrossing you, though to shew I am in Charity, I intend to see it next Summer, if that is not too bold a word, in an age of such incidents, and uncertainties, as this wee live in ; If this resolution should fayle I have one which never can, and that is, to bee ever

my dear L<sup>ds</sup>,  
most faithfull humble servant  
HALIFAX.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Longleat MSS.* Addressed: ‘For the right hon<sup>ble</sup>, the L<sup>d</sup> Vicount Weymouth at Longleat, to bee left at Frome Wiltshire.’

<sup>2</sup> Evidently a reluctance for the onerous expenses of the sheriff’s office is not confined to the country gentlemen of this century.

<sup>3</sup> Seal, the Savile owl.

## CHAPTER X.

IN DISGRACE, 1685-88.

PART I.—PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL, FEB. TO OCT. 1685.

1685<sup>2</sup> KING JAMES lost no time, as we gather, in emphasising the changed situation. 'Halifax,' says Burnet<sup>1</sup> in his contemporary record, 'had a secret audience three daies after he came to y<sup>e</sup> Crown in w<sup>ch</sup> he made some excuses to y<sup>e</sup> King for y<sup>e</sup> distance in w<sup>ch</sup> he had lived w<sup>th</sup> him of late, w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> King put by handsomely enough, telling him y<sup>t</sup> he would remember nothing y<sup>t</sup> was past, except his behaviour in y<sup>e</sup> business of the Exclusion.'<sup>2</sup> to this Halifax replied y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> King knew upon w<sup>t</sup> bottom he stood and y<sup>t</sup> as long as y<sup>e</sup> King exacted no other Service of him y<sup>n</sup> y<sup>t</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> was consistent w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> law, no man should serve him w<sup>th</sup> more Zeal.' His Majesty, none the less, foreshadowed the impending triumph of Rochester, whose appointment to the office of Treasurer was announced on the following day;<sup>3</sup> while Halifax, much to his disgust, found himself 'kicked up'<sup>4</sup> in his turn<sup>5</sup> to the discredited dignity of Lord President (the post vacated by his rival), in order to release the Privy Seal for Lord Clarendon, that rival's brother.

Nor did this mortification adequately symbolise the extent of his lordship's disgrace. 'The King of England,' writes Barillon,<sup>6</sup> 'told me that having retained all the officers of the household of the late King his brother he wished also to give this proof of his moderation, in not suffering the Marquis of Halifax to be entirely unemployed;

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 115a. The parallel passage of printed *History* (iii. 8) is less full, and, no doubt by accident, less distinctly in favour of Halifax.

<sup>2</sup> This saying is mentioned by Lord Strafford in a letter to Lord Halifax, February 18 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [21]).

<sup>3</sup> So Burnet, MS.; Kennet (iii. 428) says February 16.

<sup>4</sup> Bramston, pp. 171, 259; Burnet, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 115.

<sup>5</sup> Kennet, iii. 428 (February 18).

<sup>6</sup> Fox, appendix, p. xxxviii; translation, pp. 32, 33.

but that he knew him, and could never rely upon him; that he admitted him to no share in the real secret of his affairs, and that his office of President would only show the little credit he was in. . . . His Majesty entered at great length with me into the reasons which have obliged him to continue in office those who are known to have been his most dangerous enemies during the life of the King his brother.'<sup>1</sup>

The expressions of James convey with perfect accuracy the position occupied by Lord Halifax during the six months for which he continued to hold office. Lord Rochester indeed, when excusing to the French Ambassador<sup>2</sup> in servile fashion the issue of writs for an immediate session, which had become indispensable through the lapse of the Parliamentary revenues,<sup>3</sup> urged as an exculpatory argument that James knew this step would have been pressed upon him by the Keeper and Lord Halifax, and that he wished to anticipate their advice. In practice, however, the Lord President was little more than a dignified cypher in the Administration.

He accepted his defeat, meanwhile, with polite and courtly resignation, informing Sir John Reresby 'that he and my Lord Rochester, Lord Treasurer, continued kind,'<sup>4</sup> that he used his constant endeavours to serve the King, and would continue them, hoping his Majesty would put no discouragement upon them by imposing the Popish religion, which he seemed sorrowfully to apprehend. . . .

It was not, however, in the nature of Lord Halifax to acquiesce in his own political annihilation, or to refrain from offering counsel, however unavailing. We find him warning King James against the folly of publicly declaring that any attempts to grant the revenue for a temporary period would be met on his part by an immediate dis-

<sup>1</sup> The *Dutch Despatches*, with rather rueful courage, attempt to minimise the significance of these Ministerial changes. 'It being agreed by all the world that the said Marquis will to-day assume that honourable charge with great lustre, on account of his dignified qualifications and talents' (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, t. 206, March 2).

<sup>2</sup> Barillon, February 19; Fox, appendix, p. xx; translation, p. 14.

<sup>3</sup> On the demise of the Crown.

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, April 18, p. 322.

<sup>5</sup> Mazure (i. 419), probably quoting Barillon, considers that on the King's accession Rochester, Clarendon, and Halifax headed the Moderate party in the Council. Rochester was, of course, less extreme than Sunderland, and perhaps a sudden movement of alarm on the accession of a Papist produced a momentary sympathy. It is certain that the relations of Rochester and Halifax immediately before and subsequent to this date were anything but cordial.

1685 solution of Parliament.<sup>1</sup> The remonstrances of the Lord President, though moderate in tone, were very uncompromising in tenor. Such threats he stigmatised as unprecedented, pointing out that they would but irritate Parliament, which, even when desirous of propitiating the Sovereign, is very jealous of interference. The pride of a great assembly, he argued, is a dangerous thing to wound, since injured vanity can lend courage even to the vacillating and the fearful; and he dwelt upon the importance attaching to these preliminary steps.<sup>2</sup> Nor was this the only occasion on which he formulated his suggestions, for the Marquis himself told Beresby on April 23,<sup>3</sup> 'that he had, in two particular and private audiences with the King, told him his mind with that plainness in relation to his service in point of government, that he wondered the King, considering his temper, took it with that calmness.'

'The Marquis, again, never attempted to curry favour by any, even the slightest, compliance with the King's ecclesiastical predilections. Barillon<sup>4</sup> has told us, and Macaulay with his usual vividness has pictured how, when King James, in State, repaired to the rites of his Communion, Lord Sunderland accompanied him, and Lord Rochester evaded a decision; 'whilst Halifax, standing, with the old Duke of Ormond<sup>5</sup> immovable in the antechamber, watched 'the time servers who had pretended to shudder at the thought of a Popish King, and who had shed without pity the innocent blood of a Popish Peer now elbow each other to get near a Popish altar.'<sup>6</sup>

But whatever his apparent equanimity, it is suffi-

<sup>1</sup> These menaces were conveyed by James through Jeffreys while on circuit, and were directly communicated by the King to the Council.

<sup>2</sup> Mazure, i. 421. No authority cited—probably from Barillon.

<sup>3</sup> Coronation Day. Halifax had been one of the Committee of Council appointed to modify the formularies in accordance with the King's scruples. (North's *Life of North*, i. (Jessopp's [Bohn's edit.] 342.) The Communion was omitted, probably despite the wishes of Archbishop Sancroft, who was described by Halifax as *sede vacante*. Mazure (i. 411) makes the startling announcement that Halifax did not attend the Coronation. This seems incredible. Mazure is apparently thinking of his abstention from Mass at the chapel.

<sup>4</sup> Barillon, April 30, appendix to Fox, p. lxvii, translation, p. 62. The occasion was the Easter Mass.

<sup>5</sup> The gallant old Cavalier was not always cordial to Lord Halifax, if we may interpret his sentiments by those of Carte. It is certain, however, that Halifax respected the Duke; and they shared a common antipathy to France and to the Ministry of the Ruelle.

<sup>6</sup> Macaulay, edit. 1858, ii. 44.

ciently obvious that Lord Halifax anticipated the future 1685 with very justifiable misgiving, and resented with poignant mortification the explicit reverse which had befallen him. We find him retailing to Reresby<sup>1</sup> 'several passages of the late King's kindness to him,' and it is no doubt upon the hints of the Marquis that Reresby adds, 'certainly no man was in greater favour with him, when he unfortunately died.'

Nor can the Marquis have failed to extend a very sincere sympathy towards the accomplices whose misfortunes had been involved in his own. The disappointment of the Duke of Monmouth,<sup>2</sup> as of the Prince of Orange himself, must have been necessarily extreme. The Stadtholder, however, with his usual imperturbable fortitude, accepted the changed situation, and, faithful as ever to his one political ideal, determined, by persevering and respectful assiduity, to detach his exalted kinsman from the trammels of a French alliance. He did not despair of success, for the military reputation of the new monarch and the events of 1678 gave some reason to hope that he was not altogether impervious to the motive of international emulation.<sup>3</sup> This change of policy of course complicated relations between the Prince and the young Duke of Monmouth, his recent ally. On the whole, William appears to have extricated himself as well as circumstances permitted from a very difficult dilemma. He begged his young cousin to leave The Hague before his extradition should be demanded, and urged that he should enter the service of the Emperor in the capacity of a soldier of fortune.<sup>4</sup> The solution appeared sufficiently attractive to the mind of the disillusioned exile, and it is practically certain that but for the fatal solicitations of the Scotch and English refugees, which brought him three months later, by way of Sedgemoor, to the block, the Duke would have acquiesced in these well-meant proposals.<sup>5</sup>

The hopes which William entertained of attracting the English alliance seem to have been shared by the Marquis himself, and appeared to him as affording almost

<sup>1</sup> April 18, *Memoirs*, p. 323.

<sup>2</sup> See d'Avaux, iv. 271.

<sup>3</sup> See d'Avaux, vols. iv. and v. for this; Mackintosh ably demonstrates the reality of the Prince's advances.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet, iii. 14, 15; and Ralph, i. 853. The Prince entertained a high idea of his cousin's military talents (Mazure, i. 465).

<sup>5</sup> See the remarkable letter printed by Welwood (appendix, p. 379) on the authority of Spence.



1685 the only prospect of salvation which the existing situation admitted.

Halifax (writes Burnet in his contemporary record<sup>1</sup>) told me there were two things<sup>2</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> only could save us : y<sup>e</sup> one was y<sup>t</sup> perhaps y<sup>e</sup> King would declare himself against France and for bringing y<sup>e</sup> State of Europe to a Righter Ballance. He told me y<sup>t</sup> both y<sup>e</sup> Court of Spain and y<sup>e</sup> States would certainly make such addresses to y<sup>e</sup> King<sup>3</sup> y<sup>t</sup> he would have all y<sup>e</sup> offers made him y<sup>t</sup> were possible if he would depart from y<sup>e</sup> French Interest, and by this wee would be quickly able to judge, whether bigotry or a desire of Glory wrought most powerfully on y<sup>e</sup> King, since it might be concluded if y<sup>e</sup> King did not go into y<sup>e</sup> propositions w<sup>ch</sup> would be made him, y<sup>t</sup> bigotry was y<sup>e</sup> prevailing passion and y<sup>t</sup> he was engaged by his priests to turn y<sup>e</sup> whole strength of his Governm<sup>t</sup> to serve their ends.

The hope thus attributed to Lord Halifax derived some plausibility from the attitude of reserve which James on his accession affected towards the Court of Versailles,<sup>4</sup> and from the cordial reception which he accorded to the Dutch overtures for a renewal of existing treaties. 'This ostentation of magnanimity, though based upon sordid calculation,' has deceived even later historians, who, while aware that it was compatible with secret pecuniary dependence and 'the private expressions of a degrading subserviency,' have surmised on the part of James a real anti-Gallican ambition.<sup>5</sup> This view is

<sup>1</sup> British Museum (*Harleian MSS.*) 6,584, f. 117. The interview probably took place in April, as the Doctor left England early in May; his motives being that he had asked, through Halifax, leave to pay his duty to the new King, and had been refused. This harshness and still more the undignified and impolitic rancour with which James pursued him in Holland certainly changed him from a Moderate politician into an uncompromising opponent of the House of Stuart. (See Mazure, iii. 342.)

<sup>2</sup> The second depended on the action of the impending Parliament. (See below, p. 444.)

<sup>3</sup> Halifax feared that the sudden desire of M. de Ruvigny to visit his niece, Lady Russell, was only a blind to cover political intercourse between the Crowns, and begged Burnet to hinder the journey, if possible, on his arrival in France (Burnet, British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 142). Ruvigny had his audience on <sup>July 27</sup> August 6 (*Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, f. 349b). Later, probably on information from Ruvigny himself, Burnet became convinced that the journey of the old statesman had no political meaning. (See *History*.)

<sup>4</sup> See Burnet, iii. 12, 13; d'Avaux, vols. iv. and v.

<sup>5</sup> Pecuniary differences had arisen, as we know, between Charles and Louis as to the payment of subsidies; and something was certainly due to him at the time of the former's death. The arrears, which Louis with prompt foresight immediately transmitted to London, exercised a direct influence on the situation. (See Barillon's despatches in Fox.)

<sup>6</sup> See the well-known despatches of Barillon in Fox.

<sup>7</sup> They lay special stress on Mazure, ii. 165.

certainly erroneous, for the foreign policy of James II. 1685 was in effect one of weak and blundering oscillation. Sympathies at once personal and political, together with pecuniary attractions, impelled the English monarch towards the friendship of France, while motives of a stringent kind forbade too close an approximation. In point of fact, James II. dreaded above all things the advent of the great war, which loomed persistently on the horizon. In such a conflict England could scarce remain neutral; and intervention, as involving dependence upon Parliamentary support and the indefinite postponement of the religious revolution, was the object of his profoundest dread.<sup>1</sup> He therefore endeavoured to ward off the threatened evil by balancing the adverse Powers, and allowing neither to assure itself of his support in the event of an actual breach. He realised, moreover, that the attempt to secure for his co-religionists any certain or permanent advantage required the co-operation of his son-in-law, the husband of the Heiress-Presumptive, and evidently believed that such concurrence might be procured up to a certain point by flattering the Prince's hopes on the question of foreign policy. A secondary good seemed to be entailed by such propitiatory attempts, for James was alive to the strength of the Prince's position as a possible centre of disaffection. For diplomacy so delicate, however, the intellect of James was singularly unfitted; and his cumbrous feeble tergiversation (still further complicated by his financial relations with Louis XIV.) was as irritating as it subsequently proved fatal.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile more domestic issues excited the anxiety of Halifax. From the first he clearly foresaw the drift of the King's ecclesiastical policy; and while fully prepared to acquiesce, according to his previous declarations,<sup>3</sup> in a repeal of the so-called 'penal' legislation, he had always perceived,<sup>4</sup> with his usual sagacity, that the real crux of the situation lay in the question of the religious 'tests.' In the hands of a religious bigot the power of entrusting the government of the country to the hands of the religious minority must, as the events of 1672 clearly testified, prove a powerful and dangerous weapon; and this weapon, in the opinion of Lord Halifax, it was

<sup>1</sup> Mazure, ii. 263, 264, 327, 383, 392, 398, 403.

<sup>2</sup> See Mazure (especially Mazure, ii. 334 and 344), where the pitiable vacillation of James is admirably characterised.

<sup>3</sup> See the *Character of a Trimmer*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

1685 absolutely necessary to withhold. In these circumstances Lord Halifax anticipated, with grave apprehension, the results of the approaching session, and told Sir John Reresby, about a month<sup>1</sup> before the opening ceremony, that 'some bills might possibly be insisted upon to be repealed in the next Parliament, which would deserve to be first well considered of.' He appears to have gone into detail; but the 'other things' upon which he dilated are declined by the cautious Reresby as less suitable to the pages of a diary.<sup>2</sup>

Existing records, however, are fortunately more confidential. In his *co-temporary* versions of an interview between himself and the Marquis,<sup>3</sup> Dr. Burnet assures us that Lord Halifax, according to his own account, 'hoped y<sup>e</sup> next Session of Parliament would be short, since it was to be in Summer, and if they did not ru[n] the nation in a heat, but left their work half done to a winter's Session, there would still be hopes, since after members had been once together, and they begin to see either y<sup>e</sup> Interest of y<sup>e</sup> Nation, or their own in particular, they would more easily be prevailed on, at least to manage their favours to y<sup>e</sup> Court so, as to make y<sup>m</sup>selves necessary, and not give money too much at once, but be so sparing in their bounty, y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Court might have frequent occasions of bringing y<sup>m</sup> together.'<sup>4</sup>

The fatal error upon which Halifax thus by anticipation lays his finger, and which so inevitably conduced to render James during his brief reign independent of Parliamentary control, was, however, adopted in the sequel by the representatives of the people. Parliament met on May 17.<sup>5</sup> Into the details of the session, which lasted till July 2, we need not enter. The King demanded a revenue and an extraordinary supply in language sufficiently imperious. Despite warnings received from Lord Halifax, to which we have already adverted, his Majesty again--and publicly--announced that the method of temporary supply, to which the Marquis

<sup>1</sup> Reresby's *Memoirs*, April 23, p. 323.

<sup>2</sup> 'not so fit for this time and place.'

<sup>3</sup> From which we have already quoted. (See *ante*, p. 442.)

<sup>4</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. f. 117b. Strange to say, this passage reappears almost verbatim in the *History* (iii. 20), but *not* in relation to Halifax. We are told that *some* fancied *all* concluded, or that such things *were hoped*. Did Burnet, in his later antagonism, grudge Halifax the credit of these sagacious forecasts? The passage in the MS. continues in the strain pursued in *History*, iii. 21, 'therefore it was resolved,' &c.

<sup>5</sup> Henry Savile and Secretary Middleton led the Speaker, a Court nominee, to the chair (Bramston, p. 196).

accords his approval, would be highly resented by the 1685 Crown. The House of Commons, in part elected under pressure, in part under the influence of that strange fit of enthusiasm which greeted the accession of James II.,<sup>1</sup> granted the revenue *for life*, voting, moreover, an extraordinary supply of 400,000l.<sup>2</sup> The proceedings against Danby and the Popish Lords were determined, and a Bill reversing the attainder of Stafford<sup>3</sup> passed the Upper House.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the *Spencer MSS.* 31 (38) are a number of letters to Halifax from Sergeant Millington, who represented Retford in this Parliament. They relate to elections in Notts. At one place a pole was borne along bearing a black box and a parchment banner inscribed, 'Noe Black Box, noe Bill of Exclusion, noe Association.' Box and banner were burnt in the market-place. Mazure, in his admirable account of these early days, ascribes this fervour to the grateful and statesmanlike character of the King's first speech to the Council, to the immediate issue of writs, to the retention of the former Ministry, the project of alliance with Holland, and the dignified reception accorded to the French Ambassador.

It must be noted, however, that James, in demanding the extraordinary supply, used language calculated to flatter the vanity of Englishmen and to create an impression that he considered a dependence on France beneath him.

<sup>2</sup> Against these two measures, which, though admirable from the point of view of equity, were certainly open to criticism in the matter of form, only five Peers ventured to protest. These were Roberts and Anglesey, the recently disgraced Ministers; and of the old Exclusion party, Lords Eyre and Stamford, and the President's brother-in-law Clare. Barillon says that Devonshire spoke for them.

<sup>3</sup> As regards the detail of the Session, we notice that one of the few bold speeches made in the Lower House was by Sir John Lowther. He attacked the regulation of the charters (Lingard), and reflected on the growing greatness of France. Barillon points out that he was related to Halifax through the Thynnes (Ranke, v. 312). On May 1, Barillon told his master of a curious intrigue among members of the old Whig party, to insist on the disgrace of all former Exclusionists as a means of getting rid of Sunderland and Godolphin. Barillon fancied Halifax might secretly encourage it from hatred to Sunderland (Barillon in Fox, appendix, pp. lxxiv, lxxx; translation, p. 70). Lessened as was the influence of Halifax, Reresby still found it exerted on his behalf. An attack had been made by some Yorkshire gentlemen on certain aldermen of York, for whom Reresby was interested. Halifax 'interposed and desired that since gentlemen did sometimes sign such papers upon credit, and that since neither the archbishop's hand, the lord lieutenant's, nor the governor's was there, it was fit the matter should be made known to them and the thing heard before they should be displaced. Further, that good lord was so concerned for me,' says Reresby, 'as to fall 'into a great passion' with Sir H. Goodricke, who had acted an underhand part in the matter, and who deprecated the Minister's resentment. 'My lord was very warm in telling me of this affair. He said Sir Henry had done ill to me in it; this was to make a cipher of the governor, and he reflected on Sir Henry Goodricke's understanding in general, and of his foolish carriage in Spain when ambassador there.' Halifax also had the writ for York addressed to Reresby, apparently in his capacity of governor. The arrangement would appear invidious to a degree in these days, as Reresby was himself the successful candidate! (pp. 327, 328; also p. 320). Reresby tells us that he received the applause of the Lord President for his advocacy of the taxes on sugars and tobacco (June 1,

1685 No record remains of speeches on the part of the Marquis, who was introduced under his new title by Lord Clarendon and the young Earl of Shrewsbury. The last-named, a young man of considerable capacity and great personal fascination,<sup>1</sup> had been, we remember, a ward of the Marquis. Upon the details of Monmouth's invasion, again, which brought the session to an abrupt conclusion, there is no necessity to dilate;<sup>2</sup> but we may believe that the Marquis watched with real and profound concern the spasmodic success and terrible catastrophe of his ill-starred political associate.<sup>3</sup>

The following letter to Henry Savile, written within a fortnight of the Duke's execution, contains no allusion to the topic:—

pp. 330, 331), though the President resented highly his support of a proposed tax on new buildings in London having, we are told, a 'deep concern therein.' The matter even threatened a breach, but the friends 'presently understood one another,' and the Marquis professed his sorrow that he had said anything to disturb his friend. 'This,' says Reresby, 'was the only time we seemed to differ, and it was soon over' (June 17, 18, 20, pp. 333-335). There are some details concerning the attempt to tax new buildings (Rulph, i. 906). It was proposed to tax the rents of all houses built since 1666 beyond the area of the fire, &c., and to prohibit further building. (See also the account of Lord Ailesbury's *Memoirs*, pp. 105-107, who was then in the Commons, acting as manager for the Court.)

<sup>1</sup> He was also a convert from Romanism.

<sup>2</sup> Among the *Spencer MSS.* (31.21) is a curious letter from Lord Strafford to his cousin, Lord Halifax, written upon reports that Monmouth had surprised the King's forces and killed four hundred, with a loss of fifty on his own side; that the Lord Mayor declined to answer for the City, where the supporters of Monmouth were as three to one; and that the King had threatened 'to beate downe y<sup>e</sup> City from y<sup>e</sup> Tower if they sturred.' In *Spencer MSS.* (31.24) is an interesting letter from Lord Weymouth (dated Longleat, July 25, 1685), asking 'first (if given a place on the Commission of Oyer and Terminer), what precedence he is to hold in relation to 'my L<sup>d</sup> Jeffries'; secondly, what proclamations of pardon, on surrender, were issued by Feversham; and whether the latest does not extend to persons surrendering after the battle of 'Weston' (Sedgemoor). An unpublished letter from Reresby in the same collection (31.13), dated May 2 in the following year, mentions a report that Lord Justice Herbert, having quarrelled with Jeffries, openly reflected on the executions in the west, 'saying ye poor and ye miserable were hanged, but ye more substantial escaped.'

<sup>3</sup> Roberts (*Life of Monmouth*, ii. 127), a very indifferent historian, endorses a curious theory that Monmouth's mysterious secret, the plea for his interview with James, concerned his earlier intrigue with Halifax, and that this explains the subsequent disgrace of the Lord President. (He relies on a conjecture of Lingard's *History*, x. 413, edit. 1849.) The total silence of James in his *Memoirs* disposes of this story. The incrimination of Sunderland (*Memoirs of James* in Macpherson, i. 146, Ailesbury's *Memoirs*, p. 117; the *Ferguson MSS.*, quoted by Eachard; and see also *Ferguson's History of the Revolution* [1706]) must mean either that Monmouth was alluding to the intrigue of the preceding year or had been deceived by his agents. Sunderland was too wary to risk anything on the success of a scheme so wild as Monmouth's.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Henry Savile.<sup>1</sup>*

London, July 23, O.S., '85.

This goeth with one from my L<sup>d</sup> Eland,<sup>2</sup> which I advised her 1685 to write that you might help us in your opinion what answer is best to return to Madame de Gouvernet, who it seemeth is desirous that leave may be obtain'd from hence for her return with her family. My Lady Eland thinketh that if you have health enough to continue the intentions you had of making a step to Paris, anything from hence in favour of her mother would be much better transacted, you being upon the place, than it can be without that help. Besides I am of opinion that the next two or three months will be so very critical as to our affairs, that it will be seen within that compass of time, whether England can in any degree be a sanctuary for distress'd Protestants. It seemeth you mentioned something to Madame de Gouvernet about my L<sup>d</sup> Cambden,<sup>3</sup> which maketh her desirous to know what grounds you have to think it feasible, besides the believing it a reasonable thing, for him to agree to it. I having already acquainted you that I have changed my mind about disposing George,<sup>4</sup> need not repeat anything of it now, so I recommend you to your waters, and wish they may do better with you than my skill in physick would allow me to expect.

In one respect, and in one only, were the affairs of this summer calculated to afford the Marquis satisfaction. Pursuant we presume to the 'trimming' policy which we have already ascribed to his Majesty, King James continued to reciprocate the advances of the States as represented by the Prince of Orange. The formal renewal of existing treaties, which was pressed by the Dutch Ambassadors, had the English King's approval. The Monmouth episode interrupted the progress of affairs, but early in August<sup>5</sup> Lords Halifax, Sunderland, Rochester, and Middleton were appointed Commissioners, with instructions to 'renew and confirm' the treaties between the two Powers. The nomination of Halifax attracted particular attention. He 'is devoted to the Prince of Orange,'

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter ccxii., p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Eland, son and heir of the Marquis, who had commanded a troop of horse during Monmouth's rebellion, resigned, in a fit of pique, about August 1<sup>st</sup> (*Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, f. 355).

<sup>3</sup> This probably alludes to some project of marriage for a sister of Lady Eland.

<sup>4</sup> Lord George Savile, youngest son of the Marquis.

<sup>5</sup> For all this, see the *Dutch Despatches* and d'Avaux, *passim*; also Mazure, ii. 40. A recent check in the money intrigue with France perhaps hastened the cordiality of James. (See Mazure, ii. 34-39; Fox, appendix, pp. cxv-cxxi; translation, pp. 112-118.)

1685 comments M. d'Avaux from The Hague. Eventually the treaty of alliance was signed on August  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and ratified early in October, being regarded as a great triumph for the Prince of Orange and as a decided blow to French interests on the Continent, especially in the United Provinces.

As regards Lord Halifax himself, however, this solitary gleam of royal favour proved but the prelude to a final eclipse. It is possible that King James, in his usual ponderous fashion, desired to neutralise the significance of this interlude by a corresponding gratification to the interests of the Court of France; and, in any case, it is certain that the views of King and Minister on matters of internal policy came immediately afterwards into irretrievable collision. The rebellion had necessitated a large increase in the military establishment.<sup>1</sup> These forces James, in defiance of public feeling, resolved to maintain; and the first public symbol of his determination to free himself and his co-religionists, by fair means or foul, from the trammels of the law, was conveyed in the military commissions conferred upon Papist officers.<sup>2</sup> At Council James went further, and expressed a hope of seeing Papists once more in the Upper House. Halifax reminded his Sovereign that certain 'Test Acts' existed, and pointed out how greatly these were contravened by the military appointments under discussion. James retorted that the supply of Protestant officers had during the recent crisis fallen short, that he intended to uphold his nominees, and expected from his Ministers not opposition but advice as to the best means of compassing his desire.<sup>3</sup> One or two private interviews took place between King and Minister, in which the former expressed himself with kindness; but the Lord President showed no signs of

<sup>1</sup> Which by this time amounted to some 20,000 men.

<sup>2</sup> For the importance ascribed to this step, see Barillon in Fox, appendix. pp. civ. cix, translation, pp. 101-106.

<sup>3</sup> This was the account given by James to Barillon, and confirmed by Halifax himself (letter to Chesterfield, p. 454 below). Burnet (in British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 127a) says: 'Halifax spoke of it twice at y<sup>e</sup> Council board, but was not Seconded.' In his *History* (iii. 69) the passage runs as follows: 'The marquis of Halifax did move in council, that an order should be given to examine, whether all the officers in commission had taken the test, or not. But none seconded him: so the motion fell.' We cannot tell whence Mazure derived his curious theory that Halifax was disgraced for criticising the repeal of the Edict of Nantes (ii. 55). Dangeau, who represents public opinion at Versailles, says Halifax was removed because he was not 'assez souple' (*Journal*, i. 246, edit. 1854). James himself wrote to the Prince of Orange, in a letter of which we have lost the reference, that Halifax was dismissed 'for reasons best known to myself.'

submission. The situation became impossible, and on the Sunday previous to October 19 Halifax, in a personal audience,<sup>1</sup> received sentence of dismissal.<sup>2</sup> At the English Court the fact did not at first transpire, though on October  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{9}{11}$  M. Barillon wrote as follows to his Government:<sup>3</sup>

London, October  $\frac{13}{20}$ th, 1685.

Yesterday morning [the King of England] took me into his closet, and told me, he had several things to communicate to me, in order that I might acquaint your Majesty with them, as he did not wish to do anything important or of consequence without imparting it to you; that the first was, the resolution he had taken not to suffer the Marquis of Halifax to continue any longer in office, and that he should deprive him of the Presidency of the Council; that I knew that, during the reign of the late King, his brother, he had had a bad opinion of the Marquis's sentiments and conduct, and did not think him sufficiently attached to monarchy; that since his accession to the crown he had endeavoured to inspire him with better sentiments, and to induce him to follow maxims conformable to those which were becoming the Minister of a King, and even a good subject; that he had seen that his principles were unchangeable,<sup>4</sup> and that, therefore, he was determined no longer to employ him; that there had been a wish to divert him from doing this<sup>5</sup> previous to the meeting of Parliament,<sup>6</sup> and to induce him rather to make use of the Marquis of Halifax in that assembly, for the purpose of obtaining with greater ease those things which he might desire: but that it was for this very reason he wished to dismiss<sup>7</sup> him from his councils; that his example might infect many persons, and strengthen the party who might wish to resist him; that he knew the inconveniences of a divided Council, and of suffering his Ministers to entertain sentiments

<sup>1</sup> Burnet's account is as follows (*History*, iii. 71): 'After he had declared that he would be served by none but those who would vote for the repeal of the tests, called for the marquis of Halifax, and asked him, how he would vote in that matter. He very frankly answered, he would never consent to it. he thought, the keeping up those laws was necessary, even for the king's service, since the nation trusted so much to them, that the public quiet was chiefly preserved by that means. Upon this the king told him that though he would never forget past services, yet since he could not be prevailed on in that particular, he was resolved to have all of a piece.' The *Harleian MSS.* 6,581, f. 127a, has 'and because Halifax was y<sup>e</sup> man of y<sup>e</sup> greatest weight y<sup>e</sup> was like to be on y<sup>e</sup> contrary side, y<sup>e</sup> King prest him to give assurances of his concurrence, and upon his refusing to do it, he was turned out, yet y<sup>e</sup> King did it w<sup>th</sup> as great a grace as y<sup>e</sup> matter could bear and assured him he would never forgett his past services.'

<sup>2</sup> *Dutch Despatches*.

<sup>3</sup> Fox, appendix, pp. cxxvii, cxxviii: translation, p. 123.

<sup>4</sup> 'que le fonds de Milord Halifax ne se pouvoit changer.'

<sup>5</sup> 'de faire cet éclat.'

<sup>6</sup> I.e. the impending session.

<sup>7</sup> 'chasser.'



1685 contrary to his own ;<sup>1</sup> that his late brother experienced its ill effects, and that he should pursue a different conduct. He added that he designed to obtain from the Parliament<sup>2</sup> a repeal of the Test and Habeas Corpus Acts,<sup>3</sup> the first of which is the destruction of the Catholic religion, and the other of the royal authority ; that he hopes to accomplish it, and that the Marquis of Halifax would not have had courage and firmness enough to support the good cause, and that he would do the less harm by having no connection with affairs, and being in disgrace. [Barillon made a suitable compliment.] His Majesty replied with a smile,<sup>4</sup> ' I do not think the King your master will be displeased with the removal of Lord Halifax from my councils. I know, however, that the Ministers of the confederates will be mortified at it, and that they had a high opinion of his power.' I answered (says Barillon) that I had acted in concert with His Majesty in the time of the late King his brother to procure the dismissal of my Lord Halifax from office ; but that I never thought he possessed the least power since the King's decease ; that I agreed, however, that his removal would be productive of good effects in England, and abroad, by destroying the opinion which the Ministers of the House of Austria endeavour to establish on the continent, that the friendship and good understanding subsisting between Your Majesty and [the King of England] is greatly diminished ; that I knew even that the Dutch Ambassadors had left England two days since,<sup>5</sup> fully persuaded that the Marquis of Halifax was one of the most accredited of the Ministers, and one on whose friendship the Prince of Orange could place the most reliance.<sup>6</sup> . . .

Two days later (October 21), at a meeting of the Privy Council, the absence of the President occasioned general remark.<sup>7</sup> The King explained ' that he had reason to be dissatisfied with the Marquis of Halifax, and thought it fit to continue him no longer in the place of Lord President of the Council.' He then proceeded to give orders that the name of the discarded Minister should be *eliminated*

<sup>1</sup> James once remarked to Halifax, as the latter records (Devonshire House 'note book'), that in his brother's time he had been a slave to the Ministers, apparently intending the inference that he should now show himself to be his own master.

<sup>2</sup> 'de faire révoquer par le Parlement.'

<sup>3</sup> The determination of James to get rid of this Act had been already expressed to Barillon. (See Fox and Mazure.)

<sup>4</sup> 'en riant.'

<sup>5</sup> October 20, *Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, f. 408.

<sup>6</sup> In his answer to this despatch Louis observes (February 6, Fox, appendix, p. cxxix ; translation, p. 126) that the King of England is justified in believing ' that since Lord Halifax has no religion he cannot be a very faithful Minister, or one much disposed towards the maintenance of the Royal Authority.'

<sup>7</sup> *Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, f. 418.

from the list of Privy Councillors,<sup>1</sup> and, Lord Halifax 1685 having within twenty-four hours resigned his appointment as Chancellor to the Queen-Dowager,<sup>2</sup> his fall was complete.

PART II.—OUT OF OFFICE, OCTOBER 1685 TO OCTOBER 1688.

The dismissal of Lord Halifax naturally attracted great attention, and proved a theme well-nigh inexhaustible for the comments of the French Ambassador:—

The disgrace of the Marquis of Halifax (wrote Barillon to his master<sup>3</sup>) excites various reflections here. He has declared to his friends that he would not have engaged himself to support the designs which His Britannic Majesty intends to pursue in the ensuing Session of Parliament, and that he preferred retiring from the Court to remaining there on condition of openly declaring himself an advocate for whatever might be undertaken in favour of the Catholics, and for the augmentation of the royal authority. Many persons say that the King of England would have done better had he insensibly engaged the Marquis of Halifax to second his designs, and made use of him to manage<sup>4</sup> in the Parliament what he might wish to obtain from it, rather than to have disgraced him merely because he would not enter into measures contrary to the established laws, and to everything that is most rooted in the hearts of Englishmen. But His Britannic Majesty reasons very differently, and thinks that nothing can be more dangerous to the good of his affairs than retaining a Minister whose sentiments and principles are in opposition to his own; and that it is even necessary it should be clearly understood that the only way to be in credit at court, and to preserve his favour, is in an implicit obedience<sup>5</sup> to his wishes, and an unequivocal and unreserved attachment to his interests.<sup>6</sup>

This incident also attracts much of the attention of the foreign Ministers. Those who are the best informed never thought that the Marquis of Halifax possessed great influence; but most of them imagined, that this would increase in proportion as the King of England should adopt measures contrary to those which his late brother (and himself hitherto) followed. The Marquis took great pains in flattering the hopes of those

<sup>1</sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 28,569, f. 56; Macaulay (from the Council Books). The King told the Prince of Orange it was for reasons 'best known to myself.'

<sup>2</sup> *Dutch Despatches of* <sup>October 1<sup>st</sup></sup> <sup>November 2<sup>d</sup></sup> British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG, f. 418.

<sup>3</sup> November 5. (Fox, appendix, p. cxvxx; translation, p. 127).

<sup>4</sup> October 30. 'ménager.'

<sup>5</sup> 'de suivre aveuglement ses volontés.'

<sup>6</sup> 'attachement à ses intérêts qui ne sont sujet à aucune interprétation ni réserve.'

1685 whom he knew to be desirous that His Britannic Majesty should unite himself closely with the Prince of Orange, and relax a little in his too intimate connexion with Your Majesty; which, it was expected, would be brought, in the end, to an entire separation of your interests and his. The scheme was supported by the Marquis, who thought that as long as a good understanding subsisted between Your Majesty and the King his master he would have no great share in his master's confidence; but that in the event of his altering his conduct the other Ministers would lose somewhat of their power, while his own would increase. For some years past the Spanish and Dutch Ambassadors have considered him as their principal advocate, and contributed to strengthen the reports spread abroad, that Lord Halifax had a great part in the resolutions which were adopted. The Count de Thun's Secretary, who remains here in the quality of Imperial Secretary, could not refrain from saying to several persons that it was very strange the King of England should have dismissed the Marquis of Halifax from his Councils, after the obligations he was under to him for having so zealously supported his interests, or rather his right in the Parliament, during the discussion of the Exclusion Bill.

Thus discourse has come to the King's ear, who has found great fault with it. The fact is, that the Marquis of Halifax, to obtain the late King's confidence, strongly supported the succession against the Earl of Shaftsbury, and was then at the head of those in the Upper House who opposed the Bill for excluding the Duke of York, which had already passed in the House of Commons. But the day after this Bill was rejected the Marquis proposed certain compromises inimical to the Duke of York, and more fatal to him than the Exclusion Bill; the most important was, exile during the life of the late King, and such great restrictions upon his authority in case of his succeeding to the crown, that the measure was considered more dangerous and less admissible than the Exclusion Bill. From that period the Marquis of Halifax has always declared himself openly against the Duke of York, and opposed everything advantageous to him.

I have been assured that the Queen Dowager will not retain the Marquis as her Chancellor; <sup>1</sup> nor does he himself think he can keep that office; he is, however, on pretty good terms <sup>2</sup> with Her Majesty, and has procured for Mr. Thynne, his cousin, <sup>3</sup> the office of Treasurer of her Household. . . .

Lord Preston <sup>4</sup> has succeeded the Marquis of Halifax in the office of Chancellor to the Queen Dowager. <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *Dutch Despatches* mention his resignation some days earlier. (See *ante*, p. 451, note.)

<sup>2</sup> 'assez bien.'

<sup>3</sup> Henry Frederick; in the original 'Le Sieur Tin.'

<sup>4</sup> Recently recalled from France.

<sup>5</sup> He seems to have entered office on November 20, and was sworn of the Council on November 21.

To this despatch from Barillon the French monarch 1685 answered as follows :—

November  $\frac{10}{11}$ th, 1685.

Monsieur Barillon, your letter of the 5th of this month informs me of the different opinions which are entertained where you are on the disgrace of the Marquis of Halifax; but whatever effect it may produce, you are well aware that it cannot but be very advantageous to my interests, that a Minister so devoted to Spain and so inimical to the Catholic religion, has been removed from the councils of the King of England; and I assure myself moreover that this act of firmness will still further augment the authority of the King, and even make the Parliament yield more readily to what he may desire of it. I leave it to your prudence to inform him of my sentiments on this subject, if you think proper.<sup>1</sup>

After these remarkable criticisms on the situation, all others fall somewhat flat, yet we may remark that the cautious Luttrell<sup>2</sup> attributes the disgrace of Halifax (on rumour) to his 'opposing some matters proposed in council to be offered the next meeting of the parliament,' and that Reresby,<sup>3</sup> bewailing the news, regrets him, not only as 'ever a true and kind patron' to himself but as 'a man of extraordinary parts,' which made Reresby 'the more concerned, fearing that the public might suffer as well as his friends for want of so able a person in all business.' Elsewhere Sir John remarks: 'This lord was so generally looked upon as a wise man and a good subject, that the removal of him, especially at the beginning of Parliament, astonished a great many, and made them fear . . . a change of councils as well as councillors.' From Halifax himself Reresby, on his own arrival in town for the session, heard 'the particulars of his being dismissed from the Presidentship of the Council. He said he might have continued with greater advantages than ever, if he would have joined in some things which he saw were contriving to be carried on, which he could not agree to; that the King parted with him with kind expressions, did assign<sup>4</sup> no cause for his dismissal, nor would put any person in his place.'<sup>5</sup>

But Lord Halifax explained himself most fully by two letters to his friend Lord Chesterfield, who in a very

<sup>1</sup> Fox, appendix, p. cxxxiii; translation, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 343, October 21 and October 28. Reresby met Goodricke and the Archbishop of York, who told him no reason was assigned for the disgrace (*ibid.*).

<sup>4</sup> November 14, p. 345.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> I.e. in public.

<sup>7</sup> The Presidency of the Council was often in abeyance.



1685 eulogistic epistle<sup>1</sup> had desired him to further the Earl's resignation of the Justiceship in Eyre, to which office Chesterfield, for reasons of health, felt himself unequal : —

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Earl of Chesterfield.*<sup>2</sup> •

Oct. 1685.

My Lord,— Depending upon the same hand, that brought mee your letter,<sup>3</sup> for the returning my answer to it, it was not in my power to send it sooner than he called for it, which he did this very moment, giving mee notice he will go with it to-morrow morning. I must now first tell your lordship, that I should have demurred to your commands, tho' they had found mee in a condition to obey them,<sup>4</sup> from the beleefe I have, that my observing them in this case had not been at all for your service. I consider first, that both the thing itselfe, and the manner of your resigning, let it have been never so well cloathed with all the appearance imaginable of respect and duty, would have been as deeply resented and produced as much anger, as the most eminent act of opposition to the king's will in relation to the publique ; so that your lordship had marked yourself to receive, upon any occasion, the utmost effects of his displeasure, without the satisfaction of contributing any thing to the preservation of those things, for which all good men may be allowed to contend, within the termes of decency. I will not alleadge my example as an argument to persuade one, who can judge better ; but, I am very well satisfied with my own method of not turning away my master ; but rather chose to receive his commands for my dismissal, which I did, after two severall audiences I had upon that subject, in which I received a great many kind words<sup>5</sup> and took leave of him very well satisfied in these two respects ; that I neither had any thing layd to my charge, nor so much as any hard words to mortify mee, nor any obligations layd upon mee, to lay any greater restraint upon mee than that which shall arise from my duty. The particulars of the discourse I had with his majesty are worth your knowing, but to long to entertaine you with by letter. I will onely tell you in short, that I have a fayre fall, and am turned away, because I could not prevayle with myselfe to promise before hand, to bee for taking away the Test and the bill of Habeas Corpus.<sup>6</sup> I

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of the Second Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 294, October 20 ; also *ibid.* p. 292, October 30.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 295, printed with the heading : 'From the Lord Halifax in answer to my two former [ones] after he left the Court.'

<sup>3</sup> It will be observed that this, like all the more confidential letters of the Marquis, never passed through the post.

<sup>4</sup> The letter of Chesterfield had, of course, been written while Halifax was yet in office.

<sup>5</sup> Probably compliments on his action upon the Exclusion question.

<sup>6</sup> We have already given (see *ante*, p. 258) some reasons for supposing that Lord Halifax had at least a great share in the passing of this Bill into law.

need say no more to convince my Lord of Chesterfield of the necessity of his coming up; and, as I have taken measures with your lordship more than with any man living, and that you have had a confidence in mee, that I never did nor will abuse, I doe, from the kindest thoughts I can have for you, summon you to execute the promise you made mee to come up, if I thought it fit for you; and, that I may not be so arrogant as to expect, that so much better a judge than I should have implicate faith in this case, I will offer you these reasons:

1. my Lord Fauconbridge and others make it their business to spread it abroad, that you will not come up; which giveth discouragement as well as dissatisfaction to those, whose opinion you value, and who have a true friendship and esteem for you.
2. If you should not come up, you will send your proxeey, which you will not put in an ill hand, and, if you place it in a good one, you will have his guilt as sure as hee hath your vote.
3. There can not be so good an opportunity for your being eased of your place, as to have it taken away; which it certainly will be for your voting in these matters against the court.

1. To shew you that it is neither out of any eagernesse of my own, nor out of a desire to engage so noble a freind to take part in my danger. I doe solemnly protest to you, upon my faith, that by the best calculations I can hitherto make of a thing of this nature, which must be lyable to uncertainty, I beleive these two things probable: either, that upon sounding men they will be so discouraged as not to attempt these things; or, if they doe, that they will fayle in them. Your lordship would wonder what kind of men are resty in this case; men that wear red coats,<sup>1</sup> that have leapt hedge and ditch in everything else, but swear they will never give up these bills. I may bee mistaken, but I would not for the world make use knowingly of a false argument to mislead your lordship, and it would therefore trouble mee that such a criticall thing as this should either be prevented or baffled without your having a part in it, as you have hitherto had in every thing that was just and honourable for you to appeare in. Lord Nottingham, Bishop of London, Lord Bridgewater, all the Bishops, Lord Danby—may even my Lord Culpeper, if he may be relyed upon,<sup>2</sup> many of those who are called Court lords, talke freely in this case. In the house of Commons the Sollicitour Generall resolved to lay himself out in it: those who are managers for the court there do, to my knowledge, swear they will oppose earnestly. The officers in the army begin to think the repealing the Test will be voting themselves out of their places; in short, I doe againe repeat it that I am extremly perswaded these things will not be carried. There is another thing which, I imagine, may chiefly discourage your lordship from a journey at this time, that is the tryals;<sup>3</sup>

1685

<sup>1</sup> Probably Officers of the Royal Household, Courtiers—red being the colour of the Royal livery.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet gives a severe character of Lord Culpeper.

<sup>3</sup> Of the lords charged with complicity in Monmouth's rebellion.

1685 to this I offer, that, first, it is pretty sure all the lords will be summoned upon such an occasion,<sup>1</sup> and you would bee lesse willing to disobey their summons in this than in most cases. If any thing under heaven concerneth the lords and their posterity, it is that they should be judged by a great number rather than by a small one.<sup>2</sup> The imployment, no doubt, is unpleasant, but the consequence of declining it might be much more so; besides, in your case, if you have a particular tenderness, I engage myself so farre to comply with it, as to contrive wayes to excuse your lordship, when I will not go about to do it for mysele. And a great deale will be allowed by your friends to a man of your importance, provided they may have your countenance and assistance, if there should be occasion, in defending those bills which are the strongest bulwarks of all that is left us.

This session will either produce moderation of one side, or else, after men have done their duty, give them ease for ever hereafter from contending to no purpose. Upon these reasons, I conjure you, for your own sake as well as ours, to come up; but, at the same time I must assure you, that let your resolutions be what you please, mine shall ever bee to bee,

My dear Lord.

Your most faithfull, humble and obedient servant,

HALIFAX.

In return<sup>3</sup> Lord Chesterfield expressed an opinion that a studied seclusion in the country must procure him the desired dismissal, which could scarcely follow from action on his part in the House of Lords without a violation of Parliamentary privilege. He further expressed his great objection to taking part in the trials of the lords accused of complicity in Monmouth's rising. The evidence, he submits, is not likely to be more trustworthy than that against Stafford; yet a vote in their favour would be construed as disloyalty. As a compromise he offers Halifax his proxy, and chides him for supposing that his friend could be influenced by fear of personal consequences.

Lord Halifax responded as follows:—

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Earl of Chesterfield.*<sup>4</sup>

Nov. 10, 1685.

My Lord,—Upon the best consideration I am capable of, I doe still persest in my opinion, that this is not a seasonable

<sup>1</sup> By a call of the House.

<sup>2</sup> Because there would be less danger of a packed court.

<sup>3</sup> Printed *Letters*, p. 302 (November 5). The original is in *Spencer MSS.* 31 (19) as November 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters of Second Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 306, headed: 'From the Lord Halifax, in Answer to my former.' The date, as in the case of many letters among this collection, is incorrect, and should be November 9.

time for your lordship to surrender your office; and, that by 1685  
 staying a little longer, you may chuse a time, in which it will  
 bee lesse ill taken than it would be at present. As to your  
 coming up, I am to tell your lordship, the house is to bee called  
 within a week;<sup>1</sup> and, I could wish with all my hart, that you  
 would overrule your aversion to the journey, since I make very  
 much difference between my Lord of Chesterfield and his proxy.  
 I know of what weight your assistance is in speaking, as well  
 as your countenance in being present; and as for the tryals,  
 your friends would so order it, that wee could get you excused  
 one way or other, tho' you were in town, provided wee might  
 reserve you for some of those criticall debates upon which, to  
 our thinking, every thing dependeth. I have perswaded my  
 Lord Waymoth to come up, who had taken other resolutions;  
 but after all, if your lordship can not comply with the wishes  
 of your freinds in this particular without doing too great a  
 violence upon your inclination, I shall not bee less zealous  
 to serve you in your own way, than I have appeared to be in  
 pressing you to agree with mine; and, therefore, in that case,  
 I shall propose to you, that you will immediately give order that  
 I may have your proxie: then upon caling the house the next  
 week, when your lordship is named, I will say you have  
 acquainted mee, you are at present very much indisposed, but  
 that you intend, as soon as you can do it with any safety, which  
 you hope may be in a little time, to come up and attend the  
 house; and, in the mean time, that you will put your proxie  
 into my hands. This, I suppose, may bee better than an  
 excuse for your absence during the whole session; by this  
 way, if you continu (*sic*) to be of the same mind, you may attaine  
 your end without being put to send up affidavits of the condition  
 of your health, which some lords talke of, and as it hath been  
 sometimes practused, if your lordship remember it.<sup>2</sup> The  
 king's speech this day, in which hee asketh mony for his  
 army, and telleth us, hee intendeth to keep the popish officers,  
 hath put the commons into so ill humour, that tho' they were  
 pressed to vote a supply immediately, they have put of the  
 consideration of the whole speech till Thursday, at which the  
 court is not at all satisfied. I need not make any apology for  
 that, which your lordship sayeth looketh less kind than you  
 might expect from mee; since my meaning in this and all other  
 things relating to you shall be such, as shall sufficiently justify  
 me, that I cannot have a thought disagreeing from the pro-  
 fessions I have made of being ever,

My Lord,

Your lordship's most humble  
 and most obedient servant,

HALIFAX.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See order to this effect in *Lords' Journal*, xiv. 75, November 9.

<sup>2</sup> Probably on the motion of Halifax, the absence of Chesterfield was condoned (*Lords' Journal*, xiv. 83, November 16).

<sup>3</sup> In answer (November 13, *Letters*, p. 309) Lord Chesterfield refers to



1685 The King's Speech at the opening of Parliament, to which Lord Halifax here refers,<sup>1</sup> had exaggerated the very unfavourable impression already made by the employment of the Papist officers.<sup>2</sup> The King, as Halifax remarks, had openly announced his intention of maintaining the recent levies, in the capacity of a standing army while retaining, in defiance of the Tests, the obnoxious commander, and had the effrontery to demand an additional supply for objects so distasteful to his subjects. The Lords, indeed, voted formal thanks for the speech;<sup>3</sup> but the Lower House, hitherto so subservient, showed strong symptoms of discontent. A vote was carried that the *efficiency of the Militia*, the legal and popular branch of the forces, should be further secured; the 1,200,000*l.* demanded by the Government was reduced to 700,000*l.*;<sup>4</sup> and the House, while offering to secure the Papists in command from legal molestation on account of their unqualified service, gave the King to understand, in the most respectful terms, that their retention was impossible.<sup>5</sup> An attempt to require the concurrence of the Lords in this address was thwarted by the Courtiers in the Commons on the plea that the Lords, having already voted thanks for the speech, were incapable of addressing the King in relation to its tenor. But on the 19th, encouraged no doubt by the disaffection of the Commons, Lord Devonshire<sup>6</sup>—James himself being present—moved that the Peers should themselves consider the terms of the Royal Message.

The Court again attempted to prove that discussion on this head was precluded by the thanks previously voted, but Halifax sarcastically retorted that while the House had 'reason to thank his Majesty when he would

the arrangements he has made to dispose of his proxy in Lord Halifax's favour. 'I must also' (he adds) 'beg your pardon for not taking your advise, tho' allways much better than my owne; but, if a man acts according to the best of his understanding, I am confident that it will not be disliked in the other world, whatever it is in this. He concludes with expressing the satisfaction he derives from a friendship with one 'in whom one may deposit owns private thoughts, with a confidence as great as is the respect with which I am,' &c.

<sup>1</sup> November 9.

<sup>2</sup> See Macaulay, Ralph, &c.

<sup>3</sup> November 9.

<sup>4</sup> November 17.

<sup>5</sup> It should be remarked that Sir Thomas Clarges, who took a very active part in these proceedings, was the friend and confidant of Halifax; and that Lord Preston, who had returned from France, pressed for a handsome supply in order to enable the King to play a *dignified part on the Continent*. He was, no doubt, sincerely deceived.

<sup>6</sup> Who has hitherto appeared in this work as Lord Cavendish and a member of the House of Commons; he had recently succeeded his father.

1685  
speak to them at all; they ought with greater reason to thank him when he spake plainly to them.'<sup>1</sup> Lord Anglesey, Lord Mordaunt (afterwards celebrated as the Earl of Peterborough), Lord Nottingham, and the Bishop of London, also distinguished themselves in the debate; the discussion closed with another 'keen speech' from Halifax;<sup>2</sup> and as the Government dared not take a division, the debate on the King's Speech was unanimously arranged for the following Monday. It has been stated that the Opposition Lords intended meanwhile to fortify themselves by the opinion of the Judges;<sup>3</sup> but James had seen enough for his purpose. Within twenty-four hours he prorogued till February, after a ten days' session, a Parliament which, in the event, never sat again. As a punishment for his share in the proceedings the Bishop of London was dismissed from the Council, and on December 1<sup>st</sup> Lord Sunderland, without resigning the Seals, took his brother-in-law's former place as President of the Council—a post which, out of courtesy to Lord Halifax, James had so far forborne to fill.<sup>4</sup>

The appointment was extremely significant. Jealous of the Hyde brothers, Sunderland had determined to outstrip them by unscrupulous complaisance. With almost superhuman address he insinuated himself into the confidence of the Queen as well as of the priests, and supported by their influence and by that of the French Court (from which he received pay); supported most of all by his own adroitness, power of flattery, and perfect absence of principle, he remained in effect Prime Minister from the end of 1685 until the autumn of 1688 monopolising, in common with a knot of incapable and ignorant Papists,

<sup>1</sup> Von Ranke, v. 362, 363.

<sup>2</sup> This expression is quoted by Macaulay, apparently from Adda (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,595, l. 304). Adda says that the resolution had followed upon severe opposition in the Lords: 'e dopo tutti dal Milord Halifax chi dispose a quelli che avevano parlato in favore del Re.'

<sup>3</sup> We have given what seems the most natural account of this crucial debate, but the authorities differ to the most extraordinary extent. (1) Burnet ascribes the retort to *Deronsure* on the 9th, and is followed by Ralph, Oldmixon, Dalrymple, and Mazure. (2) The biographer of James II. ascribes it to Halifax on the 9th, and is followed by *Parliamentary History*, iv. 1371; Kennet, iii. 440. (3) Macaulay corrects both these sources by Bramston, and aptly quotes the letter to a Dissenter. (4) Bramston says *Mordaunt* opened the debate in a maiden speech, and was seconded by London, Nottingham, &c., and opposed by Clarendon; Halifax then spoke. (5) Ralph, quoting Echard, assigns the *motion* to Compton. (See also Luttrell, i. 368, December 18; *Hist. Will.* vol. i., part 2, p. 41.)

<sup>4</sup> Luttrell, i. 366, 367.

<sup>5</sup> See *ante*, p. 453. The *Dutch Despatches* hint at the reason for filling it in the present instance.

1685 the confidence of the infatuated master whose Exclusion he had so violently advocated.<sup>1</sup>

The contemporary despatches of the Nuncio Adda<sup>2</sup> who, to the alarm and disgust of Englishmen, had recently arrived from Rome give a curious and interesting view of the light in which Lord Halifax was regarded by the more moderate of the Papist community :—

I have opportunities of learning (he writes<sup>3</sup>) from various persons, that many of these Lords, who are rich in Church property, among them My lord Alifax, who possesses not a little,<sup>4</sup> fear, or pretend to fear, lest they should lose them upon a reconciliation with the Church :<sup>5</sup> and this fear, whether real or pretended, is in their case a motive for opposing, and impeding whatever can advantage religion. [Again, he understands<sup>6</sup>] that certain proposals have been secretly made, by a favorite of the King's, who is a friend of Lord Alifax, to restore him to the favour of his Majesty,<sup>7</sup> and induce him to concur with the King's designs, but the desired result has not been attained ; for Alifax having observed to this individual, that he had never endorsed the King's design of removing the Test, and of upholding, in general, the Catholics employed, added, however, that some compromise (little, I fancy, agreeable to the King's dignity, and to the weal of religion) might be easily arranged :<sup>8</sup> and these opinions having been reported to his Majesty, he dilated upon the fact,<sup>9</sup> that Alifax was the relentless foe, both of himself and of the Catholics. Wherefore<sup>10</sup> from this man, who has great credit in the Parliament, and great eloquence, we can only expect the most uncompromising hostility,<sup>11</sup> and the most important feature<sup>12</sup> is, that in the Royal party there is not a man who can counterbalance him, either as regards learning,<sup>13</sup> or the name he has among the members.

A few days later<sup>14</sup> the Nuncio adds that in the event of another session, great opposition to the dispensing power

<sup>1</sup> See Beresby, December 2, *Life of James*, ii. 62, 63, 72-74 ; Fox, appendix, cxlii. &c. ; translation, pp. 140, 143, 145, 146. Adda (December 17, 1685) believed Sunderland already inclined to Rome (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,595, f. 313*b*).

<sup>2</sup> Copies, British Museum Add. MSS. 15,395-15,397.

<sup>3</sup> Add. MSS. 15,395, f. 301, <sup>November 30</sup> December 10, 1685.

<sup>4</sup> See Halifax to Savile in *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 106, 107.

<sup>5</sup> See on this point *Character of a Trimmer*.

<sup>6</sup> Add. MSS. 15,395, f. 319*b*, December 14, 1685.

<sup>7</sup> Beresby (December 22, p. 350) mentions a rumour that Halifax was returning into business.

<sup>8</sup> 'si potevano ben trovare.'

<sup>9</sup> 'essagerò in dire.'

<sup>10</sup> 'Con che.'

<sup>11</sup> 'fiere contradizioni.'

<sup>12</sup> 'la maggior condizione si e.'

<sup>13</sup> 'sapere.'

<sup>14</sup> December 21 (ff. 322*b*, 323*a*). Oddly enough, the despatch occurs verbatim in the following volume (f. 230, December 28, 1686) ; the earlier date seems the more probable.

is expected in the Upper House. The Peers maintain 1685 that at the present rate there will soon be no laws left in the kingdom.

I know that yesterday lord Halifax said plainly to a person,<sup>1</sup> from whom I had it, that the King had no such absolute power,<sup>2</sup> quoting many Acts<sup>3</sup> to prove his contention, *adding that if the King had desired*<sup>4</sup> (?) *to remove the penal laws, he might have probably succeeded; and even if his Majesty had wished for many more Catholic officers in the army, than he now employs, Parliament would have granted this;*<sup>5</sup> so that your Excellency's supreme wisdom will perceive that it is not these individual officers who occasion these contests, but it is the power of the King, which they desire to question, and to see lessened.<sup>6</sup>

These very explicit statements on the authority of a leading antagonist show, if further proof were needed, how far, at this critical conjuncture, men were prepared to go in their concessions to the Romanist party, and effectually dispose of the plea that the rupture between Crown and people was due rather to the unyielding bigotry of the Protestants than to the domineering spirit of the King.

Warned by such indications, the King on January 8 again prorogued Parliament till May. Lord Halifax paid his compliments to Lord Chesterfield on an event so agreeable to that valetudinarian nobleman, and hinted that, finding himself at once relieved from the pressure of official and Parliamentary duty, the Marquis himself contemplated a sojourn in the country :—

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Earl of Chesterfield.*<sup>7</sup>

London, Jan. 9, 1685

My Lord, --Your aversion to a London journey, may make it proper to congratulate with you for the putting of<sup>8</sup> the Parliament, which will be signified to you by a proclamation,<sup>9</sup> that will, I suppose, be sent to you by this post. I have been of the

<sup>1</sup> 'una Persona.'

<sup>2</sup> 'non aveva tal facoltà assolutamente.'

<sup>3</sup> 'Capi.'

<sup>4</sup> 'disorzo.'

<sup>5</sup> I.e. would have granted statutory dispensations to these officers by name.

<sup>6</sup> Or 'defined' (*limitata*).

<sup>7</sup> *Letters of the Second Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 283. Headed: 'From the Marquess Halifax.'

<sup>8</sup> *Sic.*

<sup>9</sup> Issued January 8 (Luttrell, i. 368). 'On attendoit,' says Mazure (ii. 74), 'impatiemment le 20 février, terme de la prorogation, pour savoir s'il restoit encore un moyen d'opposition légale dans l'assemblée du Parlement. Les espérances furent troupées par une prorogation nouvelle.'

1685<sup>85</sup> opinion, ever since the last meeting, that the day appointed in February would be carried farther,<sup>1</sup> and that we might have leisure to take the ayre this next summer; my impatience to be in the country will hardly allow me to stay till the spring; and to increase the pleasure I propose to myself in it,<sup>2</sup> I am sometimes contriving how I may take Bretby in my way. How I may be disappointed in these intentions, I know not; but they give me a great deal of satisfaction for the present, it seeming to me an age since I had the honour to wait upon your lordship, to whom I wish a happy new year, in all kinds, and a great many of them; being unalterably,

My Lord  
Your &c.

In his answer (January 13<sup>3</sup>) Chesterfield gracefully insinuates that the prophecies of Halifax have been so correct that were they not equally opposed to his interests and principles, the Marquis might have been saddled with responsibility for the recent counsels.

• By February 13<sup>4</sup> it was known that Lord Halifax had resolved to set out for Rufford about the middle of the ensuing month. His journey was, however, delayed by the affairs of his son's mother-in-law, Madame de Gouvernet, an exile, like so many of her co-religionists, from the land of her birth, where 'the Edict' had just been rescinded.<sup>5</sup> He was able, however, to start on March 22.<sup>6</sup>

The Lord Marquis of Halifax (so the Dutch despatches<sup>7</sup> record) left yesterday for his Yorkshire estates with the intention of not returning except for the Session of Parliament; he did not see their Majesties before starting, being of opinion it had been too great boldness to enter their presence, having been relieved of all his charges, but he took leave of the Queen Dowager, who honoured the Lady Marchioness, on her departure, with a beautiful diamond ring,<sup>8</sup> which she drew from her finger, begging her to wear it as a remembrance.

<sup>1</sup> The prorogation was till May 10.

<sup>2</sup> 'I hear that the Lord Halifax,' wrote Chesterfield to Newcastle, February 5, 'doth intend to turn country gentleman' (*Letters*, p. 291). Reresby tells us that on February 21, after much 'discourse of affairs as they stood, Halifax advised' Sir John to accept an embassy (p. 358).

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, p. 284, there erroneously dated January 12; original is in *Spencer MSS.* 31 (19).

<sup>4</sup> Sir William Coventry to Lord Weymouth (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* March 13 and 16. She arrived on the 15th from France.

<sup>6</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 280. The letter is evidently misdated by a year.

<sup>7</sup> *March 21*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. G4, f. 551.

<sup>8</sup> Worth, writes H. F. Thynne to Lord Halifax (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [51], April 1, 1686), more than 1,300*l.*

Lord Halifax remained in the country more than <sup>1685</sup><sub>86</sub> three months, and this seems to have been the last visit (in any case, the last visit of considerable length) which he paid to Rufford. It is possible that he employed part of his leisure in the service of the pen; we feel inclined to refer that remarkable 'Character of Charles II.' - which from a literary point of view is one of his most finished productions - to this period of comparative idleness.<sup>1</sup>

The following letter from Lord Halifax to a cousin was occasioned by a project of marriage between Lord Feversham, Chamberlain to the Queen-Dowager, and one of the Newcastle co-heiresses. Her Majesty, whose esteem for the Marquis, as the Dutch despatches have hinted, remained unaffected by his political disgrace and consequent retirement from her service, had asked for his lordship's interest with his brother-in-law the Duke:---<sup>2</sup>

*The Marquis of Halifax to Mr. H. F. Thynne.*<sup>3</sup> •

Rufford, April 28. 86.

I am come so late from Nottingham that it is but just time enough to send by the post, so that I can onely tell you that I have obeyed my orders, and if you will take my word for it very honestly, but as I feared before I went about it, our endeavours have not succeeded, and I cannot flatter myself that there is any great room left to hope except other expectations failing should in a little more time produce other thoughts. The great thing insisted on is a considerable estate in land, whereas my L<sup>d</sup> Feversham though in more plentiful circumstances than almost any man in England in other respects, cannot in that come up to what is expected. You must help to secure mee against such a consequence of this ill success as may entitle mee to a fault in it or so much as a want of that vigour which is necessary upon these occasions; I assure you upon my word I have acquitted myselfe the best I could, and you shall bee in no hazard of forfeiting your credit, if you engage it for mee that I have done so. The post will not let mee write one word more, but that I am,

Dear cosen,  
Your faithfull humble servant,  
HALIFAX.

<sup>1</sup> It was certainly written after the publication of the papers found in the strong-box of Charles II., which took place towards the end of December, 1685.

<sup>2</sup> H. F. Thynne to Lord Halifax, April 22, 27, and May 6 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 (51)).

<sup>3</sup> *Longleat MSS.* Addressed: 'For Henry Thynne Esq. Treasurer to the Queen Dowager at his lodgings in Somerset house London.'

1686

His friends in town meanwhile kept the retired statesman well provided with intelligence as well public as personal.<sup>1</sup> Nor was he left dependent on epistolary information. About the middle of May his brother escorted Madame de Gouvernet and a daughter to Rufford, returning on May 28.<sup>2</sup> The visit occasioned mysterious rumours. The Vice-Chamberlain himself wrote that the world in general, and the Rochesters in particular, had made 'very free' with the expedition in their talk; and 'y<sup>r</sup> brother's negotiations,' wrote Sir William to the Marquis, 'has made much talk heere, his stay beyond his time makes more weight be sett upon it.' In effect the attitude of the disgraced Minister, even in his retirement, aroused extreme curiosity, and we find the Roman Catholics speaking of suspicious concourse at Rufford.<sup>3</sup>

The family party was increased early in June by the arrival of Lord William, second son of the Marquis, whose time since leaving Oxford had been spent in foreign travel. While passing through London he had made the most favourable impression upon his uncles, Sir William Coventry, Lord Sunderland, and Henry Savile. The solicitude displayed on his behalf by the elder Henry has in it something pathetic. Aware that Lord Eland by a course of reckless dissipation<sup>4</sup> had alienated father and friends, and brought himself to death's door; and that Lord George—an excellent youth, but, as his letters testify, no scholar<sup>5</sup>—stood much in awe of his brilliant father, the Vice-Chamberlain implores

<sup>1</sup> Reresby's letters are among the *Spencer MSS.*, and extracts have been printed in the notes to the last edition of his *Memoirs*. Henry Savile's letters will be found in the *Savile Correspondence*. Sir William Coventry was staying, by his nephew's desire, at Halifax House. His letters contain a little political information (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [25]). Thus: (May 4) the Duke of Savoy is said to have killed 8,000 Protestants in Piedmont; the Hounslow camp is inconvenient and unpopular, many officers talk of retiring. (May 8) It is believed that dispensations have been issued to Dr. Walker, one Fellow of Brazenose, and two of University 'to hold their employments without performing the functions usually attending them.' (May 13) France obliges Portugal to drive away French Protestant merchants. (May 20) Mr. Williams (a former Speaker) has been fined 10,000*l.*, but is supposed to have compounded with Lord Dover, a Roman Catholic, for 3,000*l.*

<sup>2</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 282, 287, 289.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Plymouth (formerly Lord Windsor) to Lord Halifax (*Spencer MSS.* 31 [14], June 24, 1686).

<sup>4</sup> See *State Poems*, ii. 153. A libellous insinuation against his wife is made in *ibid.* ii. 164.

<sup>5</sup> He was at this time serving as a volunteer in the Imperial army against the Turks, and suffering severe privations by reason of difficulties in the method of transmitting money, which were aggravated by his inexperience (letters in the *Spencer MSS.*).

the Marquis to use this son at least more like a man than a boy, 'and shew a good deal of friendly familiarity, which is the best method to prevent his rebelling like one brother, and being cow'd like the other.'<sup>1</sup> The hopes of the warm-hearted courtier were abundantly answered; and Lord William, who appears to have been sensible and exemplary, both gained and preserved his father's entire affection. 1686

But over that father, at this moment, impended a cruel bereavement, the first<sup>2</sup> among a series of domestic misfortunes. On May 28 Sir William Coventry, who had long suffered under a complication of disorders, went down to Tunbridge Wells, which he regarded as a desperate resource. 'If the waters,' he wrote, 'do not cure mee, the earth must.' The treatment, however, only aggravated his sufferings,<sup>3</sup> and on June 23 he died. 'His dying,' wrote the Vice-Chamberlain,<sup>4</sup> who had attended him at the last, '... was as regular and exemplary as his living; he had his senses to the last moment, and recommended himself kindly to you.' Besides a few testamentary gifts, among them 50*l.* to Lord Halifax for the purchase of a mourning ring, Sir William left munificent charitable bequests,<sup>5</sup> and a very handsome legacy to Henry Savile. 'God comfort you for the loss of our dearest uncle,' wrote the kindly sorrowful legatee; 'upon my salvation, all he has left me does not comfort me.'

Of the effect made upon Lord Halifax by this melancholy intelligence no record appears to remain; but we cannot doubt that the loss of one with whom his relations, since the days of his early youth, had been so intimate, and whose influence had proved perhaps the strongest determining factor in his own political career, was in fact a severe blow.

Business exigencies, occasioned by his uncle's death, probably account for the journey to town, which, in July, brought the retirement of Lord Halifax to a sudden termination. As was natural, however, under the circumstances, political motives were conjectured, and a rumour obtained circulation that his lordship went up to accept

<sup>1</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, p. 291.

<sup>2</sup> We should perhaps say, the second; Dorothy Lady Sunderland had died in February 1677.

<sup>3</sup> H. F. Thynne to Lord Halifax (*Spencer MSS.*), June 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 293, 294.

<sup>5</sup> 2,000*l.* to the French refugees, 3,000*l.* for the redemption of slaves at Algiers. A short time previously he had released sixty slaves at his own expense (*Dutch Despatches*, <sup>June 29,</sup> July 2).



1686 the Treasury. Lord Chesterfield wrote in great alarm: 'The Eyes of the whole Kingdom' (he insists) 'are so fixed upon your Lordship, that you must permit men to comment on the least of your actions . . . the sober and honest party doe thinke, that next to his Majesty,<sup>2</sup> theyr happiness or misery doth more depend on your Lordship than on any man in England.' . . .<sup>3</sup> 'You can not blame the fears or jealousies of those, who in a desperat condition doe value your lordship as theyr last hope.' This letter appears to have crossed the following one from Lord Halifax:—

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Earl of Chesterfield.*<sup>4</sup>

London, July the 20, 1686.

My Lord, My hasty coming up to town was unseasonable in this respect, that, in a very few dayes, I had resolved to have given myself the satisfaction of waiting on your lordship at Brethby, where, no doubt, you have heard that I came up for a place at court; a report I met with here, at my arrivall, and heard it againe out of the country, at the rebound. I doe not find the measures now taken are such as would incourage a man to bee a gamester, after hee hath been turned out for a wrangler;<sup>5</sup> except one could divest one's selfe of those foolish things called principles, which I find the wiser sort of men use like their cloths, and make them yeeld to the fashion, what ever it is:<sup>6</sup> which is a pitch of understanding I can not yet come up to, and, consequently, am too dull to meddle with so nimble a trade as that of the politiques is grown of late in the world. I am too slow a beast to keep pace with them, now that they are upon the gallop. The four new privy councillours,<sup>7</sup> the commission of supremaey,<sup>8</sup> and severall other things

<sup>1</sup> July 24 (*Letters*, p. 325; and *Spencer MSS.* 31 '19). The whole letter is interesting.

<sup>2</sup> There is something very ingenuous in this loyal interpellation.

<sup>3</sup> He quotes Dryden's character of Halifax in *Absalom and Achitophel*, 'Jotham,' &c.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters of 2nd Earl of Chesterfield*, p. 319, headed 'From the Lord Halifax.'

<sup>5</sup> 'Wrangler—a perverse, peevish, disputative man' (Johnson).

<sup>6</sup> A hit at Lord Sunderland (?).

<sup>7</sup> A note says Queenborough, Perth, Preston, Plymouth. But from Macaulay, quoting the *London Gazette* of July 19, it is clear they were Powis, Bellasis, Arundell, and Dover (all Roman Catholics).

<sup>8</sup> Better known as the Ecclesiastical Commission. Inaugurated July 17, three days before this date (Macaulay). Barillon, we may remark, gave it as his opinion that 'Le pouvoir de cette Commission est si étendu, Elle embrasse tant de matières différentes, qu'il y a peu de gens qui se puissent dire exempts de sa juridiction. Ils examineront les aliénations des biens ecclésiastiques faites sous de faux prétextes ou sans les formalités requises, et celles dont les conditions n'ont pas été exécutées. On prétend qu'il en reviendra des sommes considérables à sa Majesté.' This passage conveys a direct threat to the possessors of Abbey lands (quoted by Mazure, ii. 132).

said to bee intended, give a pretty fayre prospect of what is reasonably to bee expected ; and every thing seemeth to bee now 1686  
 solayed open and so playne, that there is but one thing that looketh like a mistery, and that is the giving it out with the greatest assurance imaginable that the parliament shall sit at the time appointed ;<sup>1</sup> which is so strange a piece of counsell, considering the preliminaries which are made and still making, that it is not easy, by what appeareth, to reconcile it to any degree of good sense. However, it is good to prepare against every thing that may happen, though never so unlikely, and especially in a thing of this nature, upon which so very much will depend ; so that I hope your lordship will resolve to bee in town in winter ; or if you have taken a resolution in generall against coming up so soon, I beg you will so farre make an exception to the rule, as to attend the parliament, if it meeteth, and to give that very great satisfaction to your freinds here, as to allow us to depend upon it. It is supposed the Bishop of London<sup>2</sup> will be made one of the first<sup>3</sup> instances of the ecclesiasticall authority lodged in the *aven* appointed by the late commission, though hee is not conscious to him selfe of any act done, that can give them any legall hold of him.<sup>4</sup> It is believed, too, that the whole clergy will feel the effects of their power ; and some go so farre as to suppose there may be an universall inhibition of preaching,<sup>5</sup> which will be a great step, and a severe tryall upon the people, who generally place their religion in the pulpit, as the papists do theirs upon the altar. I came up with full resolution of staying but a week, yet am not onley detained longer, but businesse doth grow upon mee in this place, that I am some times in doubt whether I shall not bee forced to send up for my family, without returning to it, which is no very pleasant speculation at this time of the yeare, and when the town is more desolate and dismall than I yet ever saw it, in a long vacation.<sup>6</sup> All the entertainement and the plenty is at the camp,<sup>7</sup> where there is such feasting as hath not been known in England ; especially by your freind my Lord Dunbarton (*sic*),

<sup>1</sup> It had been prorogued in May to November.

<sup>2</sup> Already, of course, obnoxious to the Court on account of his Parliamentary opposition.

<sup>3</sup> He was actually summoned before the Commissioners on their first meeting, a fortnight after this date.

<sup>4</sup> As is well known, he had refused to suspend, *formally*, a clergyman who had preached a sermon against Popery, offensive to the King.

<sup>5</sup> A royal letter prohibiting the preaching upon controversial points had actually been issued March 5, 1687 (Kennet, iii. 454; *Somers' Tracts*, ix. p. 10). As a matter of fact, it is merely a republication of instructions issued by Charles II. in 1662. The conjuncture, however, lent it significance. Halifax himself records (Devonshire House 'note book') that Lord Clarendon once told King James at Council: 'Sir, you are Master of the presse, I hope you will bee so of the pulpitt.'

<sup>6</sup> 'Things slept in England, as is usual, during the long vacation' (Burnet, iii. 265 (1688)).

<sup>7</sup> At Hounslow. Mackintosh, who had consulted the accounts of the War Office, estimates the strength at 15,000 men (*Hist. Eng. Rev.* p. 583).

1686 who may be presumed not to defray such an extravagant expense out of his own revenues. My Lord Weymouth is so slow in his motion towards foreign parts<sup>1</sup> that it is to be hoped he will lay aside the thoughts of rambling, at least for the present. My opinion, as things now stand, is to go along with the fate of a nation,<sup>2</sup> as far as one may do it with any tolerable prudence. Perhaps there are few men of my small value in the world, that have more reasons to take their precautions against a storm,<sup>3</sup> and yet I cannot prevail with my self to be wise at too remote a distance, especially whilst I think there is any room left for to do my duty, and to follow men of more weight in anything that may conduce to a publick service. Of this I am sure, that in all capacities, places, revolutions, and times, I must ever be

My dear Lord's  
Most faithfull and obedient servant,  
HALIFAX.

In estimating the significance of this letter, one premises that the political correspondence of the seventeenth century, even when borne through private channels, always contemplated the possibility of official investigation. We may therefore minimise the pacific asseverations of the writer; but the following salient points emerge on a careful scrutiny: -

1. Lord Halifax, while announcing, from the first, an antagonism to the projects of James which verged upon the limits of constitutional opposition, gave his friends from the first to understand that he should decline extra-legal engagements.

2. The fortunes of the national party (as conceived by Lord Halifax) hinged upon the retention of the Test and Habeas Acts.<sup>4</sup> While these remained intact, the Protestants held the key of the situation; and (to transfer a saying of Lord Halifax) the heads of the constitutional opposition 'could not be hanged so long as there was law in England.' On the other hand, the repeal of those statutes (which presupposed the connivance of Parliament) must have transferred the advantage to the Papists, and placed the Opposition leaders at the mercy of the Crown.

<sup>1</sup> It was rumoured at this time that James had refused him and Danby leave to quit the kingdom (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* v. 186).

<sup>2</sup> Taken into consideration with the passage which precedes, we can only interpret this as meaning that Halifax contemplated as a last resort self-expatiation.

<sup>3</sup> It is not easy to say whether Halifax alludes to his large 'stake in the country' or to the peculiar animus against him, which he might suspect in the Roman Catholic party; the latter seems the more probable.

<sup>4</sup> See the letter to Lord Chesterfield, *ante*, p. 156.

3. In this event the Marquis, anticipating a peculiar animus on the part of the Roman Catholic vanguard, intended to consult his own safety by retiring into voluntary exile. 1686

The reflection obtrudes, that even under the circumstances foreshadowed, the position of the national majority would have been far from desperate; and that in matters political as well as judicial, conjectures occur when, to quote an expression of Halifax himself,<sup>1</sup> there is properly no 'room for prudence.' But if the patriotism of the Marquis was not without reserve, the tone of the entire epistle, no less than the tenor of the writer's career, exonerated him from a charge which has been preferred, on the usually reliable authority of King James himself.

August, 1686 [say the existing fragments of the Royal Memoirs'], Halifax sent father March to Windsor, desiring to be admitted, and that he was ready to serve the King in his own way, and endeavour in parliament to repeal the penal statutes. The King refused to admit him publicly; but he permitted him, if he really meant what he said, to come to a private conference with him.<sup>2</sup> [The proposed audience, however, never took place, since when sounded Halifax said, he would join in taking away the penal statutes: but that there was no need of taking away the test, *as the judges had declared that his Majesty could dispense with it.*<sup>3</sup>

The story is mentioned by Halifax himself, who heard it through Sir John Baber,<sup>4</sup> and is evidently based upon some overture originating with an officious priest, who—astonished perhaps to find that Halifax leaned towards a repeal of the 'penal' laws—hastened to report this at Windsor as evidence of a repentant mind. The covert hit at the dispensing power, a touch of true Savilian sarcasm, obviously escaped the notice of the slow-witted James.

Of this sardonic wit other specimens were current at

<sup>1</sup> See *ante*, p. 266.

<sup>2</sup> Macpherson, i. 119.

<sup>3</sup> 'The King thought this disingenuous; and would not admit him.'

<sup>4</sup> In the well-known case of Sir Edward Hales, June 21. The bench had been carefully manipulated for the purpose. The italics are our own. The sentence is evidently ironic.

<sup>5</sup> In the Devonshire House 'note book': 'Baber, Sr John told mee . . . that K. James told him I made great Court to him by Priests, but that hee bid them ask mee whether I would take away the test, and upon my refusall hee told them they were deceived.' See also *ibid.*: 'Embassadour Dutch told me H. Killigrew had said I used to go to the Nuncio Dadaes, and that hee saw mee going thither.' Also (*ibid.*): 'Lord Dover' [R.C.], 'told mee in Hyde Park hee was afraid hee must quite break with mee, if I did not agree to take away the Test.'

1686 the time. Lord Perth, Chancellor of Scotland, anxious to eclipse Lord Queensberry in the Royal favour, apostatised to Rome. While his political fortunes balanced, he met Lord Halifax<sup>1</sup> and 'made him a Complim<sup>t</sup>, as if they two were like to suffer both at y<sup>e</sup> same time, but Halifax answered him No my lord your faith will make you whole; and,' adds Burnet, the narrator, 'it proved so.'

In King James's time (writes Lord Dartmouth)<sup>2</sup> [Halifax] told his lady he was sorry he must part with her, but he designed to turn papist. She said she hoped he would consider better of it, but if he did, where was the necessity of parting from her? He said, because he was resolved to be a priest, [since] having considered the matter fully, [he] thought it much better to be a coachman than a coach-horse.

At this moment Lord Halifax was involved in anxiety for the fate of his youngest son, then serving as a volunteer in the Imperial army against the revolted Hungarians.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Henry Savile,<sup>3</sup>*

London, July 25 o.s., '86.

It belongeth generally to those who are in town to write to their friends in the country; <sup>1</sup> but considering what a place the town is now, and how ill qualified I am at present to inform myself of anything worth knowing, it is much more indifferent, whether or no I acquit myself of this piece of duty. Only the last news from Buda<sup>2</sup> giveth me some grounds to write to you, that, if you hear your nephew is shot<sup>3</sup> through the belly, you may know at the same time that his bowells are not touch'd, and, by a letter written four days after the action, he was said to be in a hopefull way of recovery; this doth in a great measure allay my disquiets<sup>4</sup> for him, though some fears will remain with me till I hear again, which I suppose will be in a little time. If he have the good fortune to escape this danger, such an honourable wound will be an ornament at least to him,

<sup>1</sup> Burnet (*Harl. MS.* 6,584, l. 127; *Hist.* iii. 70). Perth reached London July <sup>1</sup> (*Dutch Despatches*, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. GG. f. 62<sup>9b</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> Note on Burnet, i. 493

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter ccxxxiii., p. 295.

<sup>4</sup> Henry was still at Tunbridge, and himself taking the waters (*ibid.* p. 296).

<sup>5</sup> Ralph, i. 936 (1686): 'The Emperor . . . this year . . . forc'd the strong fortress of Buda out of the Hands of the revolted Hungarians [and Turks], 'which they had held one hundred and forty-five years.' (The assault in which Lord George was wounded appears to have been unsuccessful [Mr. Cooper's note..])

<sup>6</sup> Lord George. He is mentioned in this connection (Bramston, p. 236). Henry had heard it, and an anxious letter of inquiry, dated the same day, crossed this (*Savile Correspondence*).

and in another time might be of some use to him for the better introducing him into the world. Mr. Herbert<sup>1</sup> hath been very kind to him, as he seemeth to express in a letter he sent to Mr. Fisher, his agent here in town, in which he sayeth he will not leave Buda till he seeth what will become of your nephew.<sup>2</sup> I begin to doubt that my small affairs will detain me so much longer here than I intended, as to make me send up for my family<sup>3</sup> instead of going down to it, but of this I am not yet resolved. Yours.

*The same to the same.*<sup>4</sup>

London, July 27, O.S., '86

I writ last night to give you an account of what I heard from Buda, and, notwithstanding the good hopes given me by all the letters that speak of his wound, I must continue a little disturbed till I hear again: it will be far from a misfortune if he escapeth, both as it will excuse him for the remaining time of the siege, and as it will recommend a young man to the world by carrying such a lasting mark of honour about with him.<sup>5</sup> I forgive all Mr. Herbert's irregularities in friendship<sup>6</sup> for his kindness at such a time to y<sup>e</sup> nephew, which is so seasonable that I am very thankful for it. Since you find some beginnings of amendment in your health,<sup>7</sup> you are to continue the means of increasing it, though I confess I have a lower opinion of the vertue of waters than is fashionable for a man to have, the doctors in vogue having declared so much for them. I begin to be of opinion you may find me in town at your return,<sup>8</sup> though I am yet unfix'd in that matter.

Yours.

Lord Halifax, in effect, remained in town, and indeed appears to have made, during the course of the autumn, a purchase which eclipsed Rufford in his attentions, if not in his regard. Tempted, no doubt, by its proximity to

<sup>1</sup> William Harbord, one of those who had been most active against Halifax in 1680.

Lord George mentions 'Mr. Herbert's' kindness in a letter of September 2 from Vienna. Having his father's permission to dispose of himself as he pleased, Lord George was proposing to spend the winter in Venice, and make the campaign there the following year (*Spencer MSS.* 31.175).

<sup>2</sup> Lady Halifax came up August 9th (Reresby to Halifax, *Spencer MSS.* 31.13).

<sup>3</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, letter ccxxvii, p. 297. Lord Halifax had evidently received Henry's inquiries dated July 25.

<sup>4</sup> See Savile's own remarks on this head.

<sup>5</sup> To which Henry had alluded in his letter.

<sup>6</sup> 'My pain is I think a little abated since my being here' (Henry, as above).

<sup>7</sup> 'if in eight or ten [days] I find no better I will return to town' (Henry, as above).



1686 London, he settled<sup>1</sup> at Berry Mead Priory, in Acton,<sup>2</sup> then a country village five miles from town, and it is more than doubtful if he ever saw Nottinghamshire again.

Meanwhile the sittings of the Ecclesiastical Commission, to which Lord Halifax has already adverted, were attracting general attention. On September 6 the Bishop of London was suspended by the Commissioners.<sup>3</sup> 'According to the form of the ecclesiastical courts,' says Burnet,<sup>4</sup> 'a person under such a suspension must make a submission within six months: otherwise he may be proceeded against as obstinate.' The Bishop appears to have consulted Lord Halifax on the subject,<sup>5</sup> who replied in the following terms:—

*From the Marquis of Halifax to Compton Bishop of London.*<sup>6</sup>

Oct<sup>br</sup> 22<sup>d</sup>, 1686.

You must be obey'd whenever you command, and since you will have my opinion, no consideration must discourage me from giving it. It is in most cases safer to say nothing, but it is a maxim so little agreeing with the Rules of Friendship, that I cannot allow it where my Lord of London is concern'd. In short then, I must say, I am of the same opinion I was, when I spoke last wit<sup>h</sup> you upon this subject, only with this difference, that I am very much more so, being confirm'd in it both by my own thoughts and by the opinion of all those, whose opinion you most value. Sir W. J.<sup>7</sup> is one of them, and very clear in it, I wish he had been here sooner, because you might have been secure, not only in his opinion, but his friendship too. These qualifications would make him an authentick author with me, though he should be singular, but as it is, when the World with very little exception joineth with him in it, I confess I am very much fixt by it. all your friends rejoyce at your keeping yourself up to your character, and would grieve for the sake of the Publick as well as for your own, to see you let yourself down below it. My Lord, you have so rais'd yourself by your behaviour in your Station that your private character, tho' very valuable, is melted down into another, and a greater figure,

<sup>1</sup> Lord Chesterfield, in a letter of January 30, 1687, mentions 'such a garden as your lordship tells mee that you have taken nigh the town.' In the published letters (p. 317) this is erroneously dated 'June.'

<sup>2</sup> *Barsties of England and Wales* (London and Middlesex), part v. p. 530.

<sup>3</sup> Luttrell, i. 385; *History William III.*, i., part 2, pp. 82, 83; Burnet, iii. 112.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist.* iii. 112, edit. 1833.

<sup>5</sup> 'London, Br. . . . His letter to me about a forme of submission to bee made to K. James when hee was before the Ecclesiasticall Commission. My answer vide.' (Halifax 'note book' at Devonshire House.)

<sup>6</sup> 'Letter book' (*Spencer MSS.*).

<sup>7</sup> We cannot identify these initials. Sir William Jones had died in 1683.

such a one, as perhaps all Mens Eyes and thoughts are more fix'd upon, than they are upon any subject now in England. I would not by this, be understood, as if I was ready to advise you should make an unnecessary Sacrifice of the least interest that belongeth unto you; your own heart cannot desire your safety more than I do, but upon the least or best reflection I can make, this method will be so far from contributing towards it, that as I think it will do the contrary, by the natural progress, and the consequences it must produce. You will not expect my objections to the Form, whilst I am so entirely against the Body of the Bill.<sup>1</sup> I shall only say that the Wording of it seemeth to be as dangerous, and as liable to be ill applied as any thing that could be said. I am a stranger to the urgent reasons which may perswade you to it, and should be extremely glad, if, they may be such as may justify your Lordship, and then I am very sure they shall convince me. But this will require discourse, and is not to be determined at a distance: therefore, I hope, at least, that your Lordship will come to no such resolution before you come up to Town, where you may have my Lord of Nottingham's opinion, and that other Friends, where I saw you in Westminster. till then, I shall say no more, than that, in my judgement it is much safer to let some unreasonable men, by a wilfull mistake say, that a silent acquiescence is a want of Respect, than to give room for your Friends to fear you may hurt your cause by an unnecessary compliment. This my Dear Lord will be the general sense, as well as that of yours &c.

The remonstrances of Lord Halifax appear to have been ineffectual; since, to quote the words of Burnet, 'six months after the sentence, the bishop sent a petition to the king, desiring to be restored to the exercise of his episcopal function. But he made no acknowledgement of any fault. So this had no other effect, but that it stopped all further proceedings: only the suspension lay still on him.'

Meanwhile, on October 9 appeared a proclamation<sup>2</sup> for the further prorogation of Parliament to the ensuing February; and Lord Chesterfield, in sport, made Halifax responsible for some references<sup>3</sup> which it appears to have contained, on the necessity for a full House. To this

<sup>1</sup> This is of course a cant synonym for the petition.

<sup>2</sup> For the motives of this step see Mazure ii. 170-172. His information is derived from Barillon. The Papist Cabal had urged James to deter a session, till he had got rid of Rochester, whose presence they said, in Council, gave reason to doubt of his Majesty's intentions. James, who felt that the Parliament would hardly concur in his plans, 'fit précisément ce que tout toutes les volontés timides; il crut vaincre les difficultés en les ajournant. Il fut donc arrêté que le Parlement seroit prorogé à la fin de février, sauf à le proroger encore.'

<sup>3</sup> October 26 (*Spencer MSS.* 31. 19), 'I fancie that your Lordship . . . (who is alwayes for a full house) has contrived the putting of them in.'



1686 reiterated postponement Lord Halifax incidentally alludes in a letter to Lord Weymouth.

*The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Weymouth.*<sup>1</sup> •

London Nov: 16: 86.

If I had known, my L<sup>d</sup>, of Mr. Loudons going down to you, I would not have lost the opportunity of writing by him. The executors have not the money ready for which wee are intrusted, but they offer that which I think is as good in our case as present payment, which is, that they will pay interest for it from the day it is due, till they pay it in to us; and when that is, if neither you nor I have occasion to borrow it, I know nothing left to be done; but to place it with S<sup>r</sup> T. Fowler or M<sup>r</sup> Child, till wee can get such a security as may iustify our putting the money out.<sup>2</sup> I hope you have not resolved that nothing lesse than a Parlt<sup>h</sup> shall call you to town therefore pray give us the good newes that you intend to make a step hither, where you are not a little wanted by

My dear L<sup>d</sup>,

Your faithfull humble servant

HALIFAX.<sup>3</sup>

Lord William Savile, second and favourite son of the Marquis, had returned to the Continent in September.<sup>4</sup> He stayed during some time at The Hague, and his father seized the occasion for writing as follows to the Stadtholder. We notice with peculiar interest the entire endorsement of a cautious and temporising policy.

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>5</sup>

[December 7, 1686.]

After so long respite, your Highnesse will allow me to make use of the priviledge of presenting my duty to you, and to put you in mind that my conjectures concerning the parliament have proved true, and if you will give me leave to make my guessees of what is to come, I am of opinion that the meeting appointed in February will not hold,<sup>6</sup> there being no steps made to make it more advisable at that time than it was last month.

<sup>1</sup> Addressed: 'For the right hon<sup>ble</sup>, the L<sup>d</sup> Vicount Weymouth at Longleat, to be left at Frome, Somersetshire' (*Longleat MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> The difficulties of investment, before the adoption of a system of Government loans, were very great. Loans on mortgages, and the traffic in annuities, were the only recognised methods for cautious investors; and Lord Halifax dealt largely in either form of security.

<sup>3</sup> Seal, owl and coronet.

<sup>4</sup> Letter to his father, September 9, 1686 (*Spencer MSS.* 31 (15)).

<sup>5</sup> From the collection (now in the Record Office) known as 'King William's chest.' Printed inaccurately by Dalrymple (*Memoirs*, edit. 1790, part i., book v., appendix, p. 56).

<sup>6</sup> This prophecy was realised.

Besides, the condition the King of France is in,<sup>1</sup> which is looked upon here as desperate, is a circumstance of that weight, that it must probably either produce a new scheme, or make very great alterations in the old one. Your H[ighne]sse seeth of what use it is to stand firm and quiet, neither to yield nor to give advantage by acting unseasonably. Accidents come that either relieve, or at least help to keep of the things we fear for a longer time, and that is no small matter in the affairs of this world. I must give [you] my most humble thanks for your H[ighne]sses favours to my son, who is, as becometh him, extremely proud of them, and will I hope make it his ambition, as well as it is his duty, to deserve them; if hee should not, hee must renounce the rest of his family, and particularly your H[ighne]sses eternally devoted servant.

London Dec. 7, 86.

*The same to the same.*<sup>2</sup>

[January 18, 1687]. S.V.

Your H[ighne]sse will give me leave to acknowledge your goodness to my son, in giving him such favourable admittance, which hath made him yet more ambitious to deserve the countenance you have been pleased to afford him. I hope you will put him in the list of those who are to bee disposed of by you, since it is a tenure by which I and mine shall ever hold. Hee is so full of his veneration for your H[ighne]sse, that hee doth himself a very good office with mee, by such an effect of his judgement; yet I will not answer for it so far, but that he may have been guilty in the manner of paying his respects, in which if hee hath failed, his youth and his good intentions must bee his excuse. Hee will bring your commands carefully to mee, which will be so much the more welcome, by giving mee the assurance that I still retaine the same place in your H[ighne]sse's thoughts, though I have not of late had so frequent opportunities of recommending myself to them. In one thing I have had the luck to guess right, and not to mislead you by a wrong conjecture; that is, about the meeting of the parliament, which you see is to bee prorogued,<sup>3</sup> notwithstanding the positive discourses to the contrary. The motion of publique things, at present, hath not only variety but some kind of contradiction in it. It is very rapid, if looked upon on one side, if on the other, it is as slow; for though there appeareth the utmost vigour to pursue the designe which hath been so long laid, there seemeth to bee no less firmnesse in the nation, and aversion to change; so that conversions are so thicke, and those which are, so little fit to bee examples, that the prevayling

<sup>1</sup> He was believed to be seriously ill.

<sup>2</sup> From King William's chest, printed in Dalrymple's *Memoirs*, part i., book v., appendix, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> The proclamation was January 8, and deferred the date from February to April; its motive, a desire to influence the members (see Mazure, ii. 181).

1686 party is not a little discountenanced<sup>1</sup> by making no quicker  
 87 progresse; for that reason it is beleev'd they will mend their  
 pace; and if so, every day will give more light to what is  
 intended, though it is already no more a mystery. Whatever  
 happeneth, nothing must ever alter my resolutions of being  
 devoted to your Highness's service.

London Jan. 18, 8<sup>th</sup> s.v.

These letters serve as introduction to a new and important episode of the great political drama which was rapidly developing upon the European stage. We have already pointed out, that both the Stadtholder and the English King had cogent and significant motives for propitiating each other. William aspired to involve his father-in-law, and the realm which he represented, in the vast continental confederacy against France, then gradually forming; and with this object, had every reason to adopt, where possible, upon all subsidiary points, a conciliatory and even submissive attitude. James, on the other hand, entertained, with equal intensity, the desire of procuring, in some degree, the co-operation of the Prince of Orange in pursuit of his religious designs. That the Prince should concur in the *establishment* of Romanism, was of course out of the question; but it seemed possible that he might be induced to further certain reforms, which at worst would permanently ameliorate the condition of the English Papists; and at best might serve as an avenue to more extensive projects. During the month of November<sup>2</sup> James despatched to The Hague, on an important mission, the celebrated Quaker and philanthropist, William Penn. He was instructed to urge upon the Prince of Orange that he should declare in favour of a repeal both of the Test Act and of the 'penal' statutes; and Burnet, who was then at The Hague, more or less in the confidence of the Prince, certainly suggests that James, then, as later, engaged, in the event of William's compliance, to join forces with the States in a coalition against France.<sup>3</sup> The temptation was certainly strong; but the Prince, aware of English feeling on the point, dared not acquiesce; and at length, according to Burnet, responded in words which exactly

<sup>1</sup> See Macaulay (*passim*). The principal were Lords Peterborough and Salisbury, Dryden and Wycherley. At what time took place the so-called conversion of Lord Spencer (Sunderland's son, and nephew of the writer), a very dissolute man (Mazure, ii. 277), we have not ascertained.

<sup>2</sup> Dixon's *Penn*, edit. 1856, p. 270, note 3, from 'Van Citters,' i.e. the *Dutch Despatches*, November 20.  
 December 6.

<sup>3</sup> *History*, iii. 140, 141, 178.

represent the position so long maintained by Lord Halifax. 1637  
He 'readily consented to a toleration of popery, as well as of the dissenters, *provided it were proposed and passed in parliament*, and he promised his assistance, if there was need of it, to get it to pass' . . . but *he looked on the tests as such a real security, and indeed the only one, where the King was of another religion*, that he would join in no counsels with those that intended to repeal those laws that enacted them.'<sup>2</sup> It is needless to observe on the advantages which would have accrued to the Romanists, had James pursued the statesmanlike policy here indicated; but for such a large perception his intelligence was too confined; and Penn told the Prince that 'the king would have all or nothing.'<sup>3</sup>

Far more over from appreciating the importance of the check he had received, his Majesty, by the application of severe pressure to the members of the Court and Ministry, and to such of the Parliamentary representatives as had any dependence upon himself, endeavoured to further the interests of his darling project. About January, the Hydes, who, though compliant to a somewhat unmanly extent,<sup>4</sup> refused to apostatise, received sentence of dismissal. They were replaced, in defiance of the Test, by Papist nobles; and Englishmen saw with indignation Roman Catholic ministers at the head of the Treasury, in possession of the Privy Seal, and wielding the resources of Ireland. Members of Parliament, meanwhile, who held office at court, or who, anticipating a possible session, had repaired to London, found themselves 'closetted' (so the expression ran); summoned, in short, to the presence of their sovereign, and subjected to searching individual examination as to their views on the question of Repeal. It was clearly understood that such members as were servants of the Crown—and

<sup>1</sup> The assertion of d'Avaux, vi. 68 (on which Mazure's statement, ii. 258, appears to be founded), that William subsequently refused to concur in the removal of the *penal* laws, is obviously founded on a misunderstanding (See below for Fagel's letter.)

● <sup>2</sup> This position is carefully developed in the celebrated letter of Fagel, November 4, 1687, which embodied the sentiments of the Prince and Princess (Somers *Tracts*). Also by Dykvelt, in an audience with William (Mazure ii. 253, 254). He laid special stress on the fears of the Protestants that a repeal of the Test would enable a Papist king to pack an Upper House, which might eventually secure the exclusion of all Protestant heirs.

<sup>3</sup> Burnet.

<sup>4</sup> 'Lt Newport told me, Queen? Mary of Modena', told him that Lt Rochester had owned to her, that the taking away the Test was not a point of conscience' (Halifax, Devonshire House 'note book').

1686<sup>87</sup> in this category we recognise Henry Savile—would, if stubborn, retain their posts upon a very precarious tenure.<sup>1</sup>

Under these circumstances, the uneasiness of William became at once urgent and justifiable. His own situation, from every point of view, had grown to be one of extreme embarrassment. The strong reversionary interest which, by right of his wife, he certainly possessed in the fortunes of England, entitled him to regard, with an anxious scrutiny, the progress of affairs. He had some reason to doubt, whether the claims of Mary were not in peril;<sup>2</sup> and as the natural rallying point for the hopes of the Protestant majority, it is impossible to censure him for initiating a close correspondence with the heads of the Protestant party. Such at least was the course which he pursued. Early in February, 1686, Mons. Dykvelt, ostensibly despatched to England, by the States, on a diplomatic mission,<sup>3</sup> carried with him private instructions from the Stadtholder himself. He was specially directed to enter into the closest personal relations that prudence and diplomatic decency might permit with the heads of the Opposition: 'his 'credentials,' if we may so describe them, being contained in a letter from the Prince to Lord Halifax.' But difficulties supervened, since the Marquis was in formal disgrace at the Court, to which Dykvelt was formally accredited. 'Many Lords,' wrote Lord Mordaunt to the Envoy, shortly after his

<sup>1</sup> We find Henry Savile, on January 20, speaking significantly of 'stars falling' to Lord Weymouth (*Longleat MSS.* unsigned). In his double capacity, as member for Newark and Vice-Chamberlain, he had cause for personal uneasiness.

<sup>2</sup> Mackintosh (p. 128) quotes Adda as stating, on the authority of James and Sunderland, that the mission of Dykvelt was largely inspired by the fear of William, in this respect. Lord Halifax has recorded (*Devonshire House 'note book'*) an observation of Burnet's, which threw some doubt upon the Protestant fervour of Prince George, and his conversion would certainly have introduced into the situation a new and serious factor.

<sup>3</sup> D'Avaux, vi. 28. (See also Lady Russell's *Letters*, 1809, p. 116, February 9, 1686. 'Tis said the King is not pleased with the Envoy Extraordinary the States are sending over; he is one, it seems, entirely in the interest of the Prince' p. 122. 'He is allowed to be a man of part and integrity; what his business is, every one is left to his own guess as yet.')

<sup>4</sup> 'Le Sieur Dickfeld avoit des Lettres de créance pour toutes les personnes qui étoient du Conseil d'Angleterre, ce qui ne s'étoit point encore pratiqué; on ne doute pas que ce ne soit pour avoir un prétexte de parler indifféremment à tous, afin de mieux encher ses desseins, & que j'étois persuadé qu'il avoit ordre de voir avec tous les factieux les moyens de traverser les desseins du Roi d'Angleterre' (d'Avaux, vi. 42).

<sup>5</sup> Danby's letter in Dalrymple, part i., book v., appendix, p. 68.

arrival,<sup>1</sup> 'but particularly my L<sup>d</sup> Halifax wished to wait on you he intended to send his brother Mr. Savile with his compliments to you, who still retains his post, though in daily expectation of losing it [as he did a week or two later],<sup>2</sup> but he is in the country for two or three days. That is the reason why [Halifax] has desired me to pay you his respects, and to tell you that he shall not wait upon you unless you consider it convenient.'

Despite these initial difficulties, however, and the open jealousy of his proceedings displayed by James,<sup>3</sup> Dykvelt succeeded in inaugurating a series of meetings with the Lords of the Opposition, which seems to have taken place at Lord Shrewsbury's house.<sup>4</sup>

His attitude was one of general propitiation. He assured the Church party that the Prince would ever be firm to the Church of England, and to all (the) national interests. He promised the Protestant dissenters, in the name of the Prince (as a consequence of his wife's succession) a comprehension (probably of the moderate Presbyterians) and a toleration for the remaining sects 'in case they stood firm now to the common interest'; and he added that assurances of a similar complaisance had been received from clergy of the Church of England.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The original (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii. 559, *Debate MSS.*), without address, is dated 'Lundi Matin' (French). Dykvelt's first despatch is dated February 17.

<sup>2</sup> For his refusal to concur in the policy of repeal. See Lady Russell, *Letters*, 1809, p. 124, February 25, 1687: ('Mr. Savil was yesterday morning in the king's closet. The event is expected'), and *Dutch Despatches*, March 1, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. III, ff. 46, 51 (Savile's fall is anticipated to-morrow or next day); *ibid.* March 3 (Savile surrendered yesterday to James Porter). On March 8 Savile conveyed to Lord Weymouth the tidings of his disgrace, in which he had been preceded 'some houres by Arthur Herbert' (Master of the Robes and Vice-Admiral of England; one of the main agents of the subsequent Revolution) and 'some dayes by S<sup>t</sup> Thomas Chicheley,' his own stepfather. Poor Harry, thus summarily deprived of an office which had been so long the goal of his desire and of an official stipend which formed no inconsiderable addition to a slender income, faced his fate with somewhat rueful courage. 'Common report will have it,' he adds, 'that poor S<sup>t</sup> Christopher Musgrave is like to be the next sufferer, and who after him, lyes in his Ma<sup>ty</sup> head, whom God of heaven blesse, and send all this may turne to his good. . . . I am going to Bushey parke to reflect what course of life I shall take to, being noe longer a Courtier, a trade that having practised two and twenty yeares, I know not what difficulty I shall have in undertaking a new one.' He promises his cousin a visit provided he does not shrink from a 'Cashiered Courtier . . . an unlucky sorte of a creature' (*Louquet MSS.*).

<sup>3</sup> See d'Avaux, vi. 51, 55.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet, iii. 181.

<sup>5</sup> Burnet, iii. 173, 174, 180. Halifax, Shrewsbury, Danby, Nottingham, Mordaunt, Lumley, Herbert, and Russell attended. A premature addition of Burnet that 'there they concerted matters, and drew the declaration on which they advised the prince to engage' has misled the hasty Dalrymple into an anachronism, the belief that the revolution was even then contemplated.

1687 At the same time he remonstrated with James, in the most open and fearless fashion, upon the folly of the policy to which he stood committed, and appealed to the leading Roman Catholics, adjuring them to acquiesce in the compromise depending on a legal toleration.<sup>1</sup>

His efforts were, however, unavailing. On March 18 James, convinced that he had nothing to hope from his son-in-law, or from his Parliament,<sup>2</sup> prorogued once more the meeting until the ensuing November,<sup>3</sup> and announced his intention of abrogating, by an act of prerogative, the Test and Penal Laws. On April 4 appeared his first 'Declaration of Indulgence,' by which those Acts were virtually annulled.

A great change was thus introduced into the situation. The dispensations from the Test and Penal Statutes, hitherto granted in dependence upon the opinion of a carefully regulated judicial Bench, were indeed open to the severest criticism; but they were to some extent defensible, in respect of the large discretionary powers vested, by prescription, in the Crown. The new Proclamation, however, was far more sweeping than the Indulgence, condemned as *ultra vires* by the Parliament of 1673; and it practically rendered nugatory every sort of constitutional safeguard; and represented moreover

<sup>1</sup> Mazure, ii. 186, 188, 199-201, 215-217. For an attempt to bribe Orange by an appeal to his love of power, see Mazure, ii. 251, 252. For the attempt to entrap Dykvelt into a renunciation of the Test, see the authorities quoted by the continuator of Mackintosh (*Hist. tier.* pp. 384, 385). It seems certain that the bribe of alliance against France was again offered.

<sup>2</sup> See Mazure, ii. 201. In public he still affected confidence in his ultimate success in both directions.

<sup>3</sup> Macaulay (from *London Gazette*). Among the correspondence of Halifax at this time we may specially mention a formal letter from Henry Sidney, dated Rome, February 15 (*Spencer MSS.* 31. 21), who had thought it advisable to retire abroad, and was at this time in Italy, intending, as he told Lord Halifax, to visit Holland; also two letters from Lord Strafford, who, as the owner of Irish property, expresses great anxiety concerning the conduct of Lord Tyrconnel, the newly appointed Roman Catholic. It is possible that communications passed between Halifax and Burnet. (See d'Avaux, vi. 50, April 24, 1687.)

<sup>4</sup> A very interesting letter on this subject is among the Devonshire House MSS., dated about three weeks after the appearance of the declaration. The writer, Ed. Wilson, elsewhere calls himself the chaplain of Halifax. He describes the visitation held at Southwell a few days earlier by Dr. Watkinson, Chancellor of York, representing the Dean and Chapter: 'Yo<sup>r</sup> L<sup>o</sup>s health' (he says) 'was drunk very cheerfully. Our preacher in y<sup>e</sup> close of his sermon was very bold; he told us we must not think of buying land (as a many there never did), but rather of flight, prisons, and exile; nor of having tombs upon o<sup>r</sup> graves, while a few maggots would serve o<sup>r</sup> bodies and o<sup>r</sup> souls go to heaven in a flame,' &c. &c. 'The Chancell<sup>r</sup> in his charge told y<sup>e</sup> clergy of constancy, and referred to y<sup>e</sup> sermon in y<sup>e</sup> case. He told y<sup>e</sup> Churchwardens they were perjur'd if they did not present all Recusants and dissenters in their

a significant retort to the pacific appeals of Dykvelt, 1687 of which it effectually demonstrated the utter futility. Early in June, therefore, having thoroughly investigated the policy of the King, the projects of the Papists, and the sentiments of the Protestant bodies, the Envoy prepared to return;<sup>1</sup> and in addition to the formal diplomatic compliments,<sup>2</sup> of which he was the bearer, letters of civil respect (necessarily couched in general terms) were entrusted to his charge by the principal Protestant leaders.<sup>3</sup>

The letter of Lord Danby contains an enigmatic allusion to some 'overture' or disclosure,<sup>4</sup> which the writer, imitating, as he says, the caution of Lord Halifax, reserved even from Dykvelt. Many writers, including Dalrymple, have read into this passage, without the slightest authority, the whole design of 1688; and the

Parishes as formerly. And y<sup>e</sup> pull'd y<sup>e</sup> King's declaration of Indul. out of his pocket, and made remecke upon several heads, but chiefly on y<sup>e</sup> paragraph w<sup>th</sup> concerns y<sup>e</sup> Church of England, and chiefly on y<sup>e</sup> phrase As by Law Established - and so descended to y<sup>e</sup> next (2) y<sup>e</sup> passage in y<sup>e</sup> bottom of y<sup>e</sup> parag. (w<sup>th</sup>out any molestation or disturbance w<sup>th</sup>soever); and in fine s<sup>t</sup> they are all presentable still. And the Count of York should stand between us (if wee presented any of y<sup>m</sup>) and y<sup>e</sup> King's displeasure; These last were y<sup>e</sup> Chancellors own words. . . . Rufford now is very pleasant, y<sup>e</sup> wilderness is very delightfull. Mr. Yarborough tell us y<sup>e</sup> L<sup>d</sup> will certainly come before Midsummer, but old Nick s<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> last Sunday w<sup>th</sup> tears, it would prove like y<sup>e</sup> promise yo<sup>r</sup> L<sup>d</sup> made him at yo<sup>r</sup> going away, y<sup>e</sup> you would be down in 3 weeks' (April 25, Eaton).

<sup>1</sup> See the admirable account of his mission (Mazure, ii. 245, 246, especially pp. 249, 250: 'Ces négociations avec tous les partis' (described by Bourepaux, a French emissary) 'n'étoient pas encore une conspiration, puisque le prince d'Orange et ceux qui se rattachioient à ses intérêts légitimes faisoient au Roi des propositions également justes pour les Catholiques, et honorables pour la Couronne' (&c.). James in his final audience bitterly reproached Dykvelt for these relations with the factions. Dykvelt responded plaudly that he had entered into relations with the most considerable persons in England; that this had enabled him to give the King correct accounts of the real feeling in the country; but that he was a man of honour, and incapable of any connection which could prejudice the interests of the King of England (*ibid.* ii. 255).

<sup>2</sup> Such as Sunderland's letter in Dalrymple, part i., book vi., appendix, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Dalrymple, part i., book vi., appendix, p. 62. Nottingham, Rochester, Clarendon, Shrewsbury, Halifax, Danby, and Churchill representing the Princess Anne.

<sup>4</sup> Such is the earlier meaning of the word. (See Johnson.) The passage runs as follows. He has been free with Mons. Dykvelt: 'but yet I must confess to your Highness (which I rely upon you justice to keep to yourself) that finding his Lordship, who received those credentials, not willing to impart some things to him which are not very proper to be written, I thought it less prudent for me to say to him all that I could wish your Highness were truly informed of. I say not this with the least reflection upon my Lord Halifax (who, I am confident, is truly zealous in your service), but to shew our unhappiness who dare not, by second hands, speak what was necessary for your knowledge.'



1687 last-named writer gratuitously brands Lord Halifax, whose own letter follows, with 'that indetermination of spirit which commonly makes literary men of no use in the world.'

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>1</sup>

[May 31, 1687.]

I deferred my thanks for the honour of your H[ighne]sse's letter, till I could pay them by the same hand that brought it. Having had the opportunity of discoursing frequently, and at large, with Monsieur Dickfielt, it would bee less proper now to enter into particulars, or to make repetitions of that, which hee will bee so much better able to explaine. I shall, therefore, onely put your H[ighne]sse in mind, that my conjectures about the meeting of the p<sup>ty</sup> have not hitherto been disappointed; and if I may bee allowed to continue them, I am of opinion there will bee none in November, neither this, nor a new one,<sup>2</sup> though that is threatened, upon a supposition, that it shall bee made up of Dissenters, and that they will comply with whatever shall bee expected of them. Neither of these will bee found true, in my opinion, if the tryall should bee made; there are a great many circumstances which make such a scheme very impracticable, and the more they consider it, the more they will be discouraged from attempting it; besides, the case, in short, is this; the great designe cannot bee carried on without numbers; numbers cannot bee had, without converts, the old stock not being sufficient; converts will not venture till they have such a law to secure them as hath no exception to it;<sup>3</sup> so that an irregularity, or any degree of violence to the law, would so intirely take away the effect of it, that men would as little runne the hazard of changing their religion after the making it, as before: this reason alone fixeth my opinion, though other arguments are not wanting, and upon this foundation I have no kind of apprehension, that the Legislative power can ever bee brought to pursue the present designes; But our affayres here depend so much upon what may bee done abroad, that our thoughts, though never so reasonable, may bee changed by what wee may hear by the next post. A warre in Germany,

<sup>1</sup> King William's Chest; see also appendix to Dalrymple, part i., book v., p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> He was right. Parliament was dissolved July 1, and Bourepaux gives the reason here adduced, with the addition, however, that a dissolution would, it was hoped, dislocate existing cabals, and that by the creation of new peers James trusted to overawe the Upper House (Mazure, ii. 273).

<sup>3</sup> Compare this with the interesting passage on the opinions of the Romanist Lords with regard to conversions (Mazure, ii. 170) from Barillon, end of 1686: 'Ils lui montrèrent ensuite avec quelle facilité le jeune Roi Edouard, la Reine Marie et la Reine Elisabeth avoient tour-à-tour changé la Religion du pays . . . que, dans l'incertitude où restoit Sa Majesté, depuis son avènement au trône, il n'étoit pas un seul personnage considérable dans l'État qui eût osé abjurer l'hérésie.' (See also the Ailesbury *Memoirs*, pp. 126, 152, 165.)

and much more if one neerer to us, will have such an influence 1687 here, that our counsels must bee fitted to it; and whether or no we shall have an avowed part in it, it is pretty sure we shall have a leaning to one of the parties; and our resolutions at home are to bee suited to the interests abroad, which we shall happen to espouse. Men's jealousies here are so raised, that they can hardly beleve the King of France's journey to Luxembourg to have no more in it than bare curiosity to see it; but your H[ighness] hath your eyes so open, and your thoughts so intent upon every thing that moveth, that, no doubt, you either see there is no mystery, or, if there is, you have searched to the bottom of it. Monsieur Dickfiel will entertaine your H[ighness] with all his observations, which hee hath made with great diligence, having conversed with men of all complexions, and by that means hee knoweth a great deal of the present state of our affayres. The opportunities hee hath had, will make him the more welcome here againe, whenever there shall be a fayre occasion of bringing him. His free way of conversing, giveth him an easier admittance than hee would have, if hee was too reserved; and his being known to bee a creature of your H[ighness], encourageth men to talk to him with lesse restraint. May your H[ighness] continue well and safe, and may no ill happen to you, till I cease to bee the most devoted of your servants.

• May 31 87.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Dykvelt's mission—a point admirably demonstrated by the pen of the sagacious Mazure.<sup>1</sup> 'Le retour de Dykvelt,' he says, 'décida la fortune de Jaques II., en fixant les résolutions du prince d'Orange.' The Stadtholder felt that by definitely declining to acquiesce in his uncle's ecclesiastical policy<sup>2</sup> he had lost all hold upon his Majesty,

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> To this summer belong, no doubt, the 'Savoy' story, which has been variously reported. In February 1687 the Jesuits bought many houses in the Savoy for the erection of a college or free school, which was opened May 25. The French Protestant refugees had a chapel in the Savoy, which the Jesuits desired to possess. According to one account, they threatened to take it by force; according to another and more probable one, they offered a valuable consideration. If we credit Ralph and other authorities, the ministers and churchwardens of the congregation sought the counsels of Halifax, Nottingham, and Danby; but, by the account of the less trustworthy Dalrymple, Halifax alone appears to have been consulted. The advice the applicants received is thus reported: 'Never Hearken to any terms with the Jesuits; let them pursue their violent Measures; suffer your selves to be thrust out of your Church; for by that means you'll do' (another version says, 'you will do the sooner') 'your own Business and the Nation's' (Somers Tracts, ix. 77, February 2; Ralph, i. 912; Luttrell, i. 104; *Hist. Will. III.* vol. i., part 2, p. 96; Dalrymple, part i., book iv., p. 81, quoting *Life of Will. III.* i. 355; Ralph, i. 966, quoting Echard, *Life of Will. III.* i. 355, *Hist. Will. III.* vol. i., part 2, p. 103, [see p. 104]). For the successful frustration of an attempt to foist an unqualified Papist upon the trustees

1687 and had thrown away the only means of engaging the resources of England in the service of the European confederation. He realised, with equal clearness, the stubborn reckless fatuity with which James had pledged his energies to projects incompatible with the most elementary statesmanship; he perceived the resentment which they aroused among Englishmen of every political shade; nor was it possible to ignore the fact, that the hopes of the Protestant Opposition centred, and centred exclusively, upon the person of the Prince himself. Whether any suggestions of an ultimate intervention on his part did actually, at this period, emanate from among the Protestant leaders, we cannot tell; but we may conclude, with little fear of error, that the possible advisability of such a course began to scintillate before the mind of the energetic Dutchman.

Such schemes, however, had no place in the cautious counsels of Lord Halifax. About the middle of August, Count Zulestein was despatched from Holland on a diplomatic visit of condolence, with instructions similar to those of Dykvelt; and Lord Halifax replied to the messages of which he was the bearer in the following valuable letter. Lord Shrewsbury, to whom it was entrusted, had been, we remember, a ward of the Marquis. A convert from Romanism, his constancy had earned him some eight months before<sup>1</sup> dismissal from his regiment, and he was now on his way abroad. It is needless to add that he was subsequently one of the most active agents of the Revolution.

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>2</sup>

It would bee unnecessary to give your Highnessse a recommending character of my Lord of Shrewsbury, who hath already so good a one established and allowed in the world; I shall onely say, in short, that hee is, without any competition, the most considerable man of quality that is growing up amongst us; that hee hath right thoughts for the publique and a most particular veneration for your Highnessse; hee is loose and untied from any faction that might render him partiall, or give a wrong bias to his opinion; and I do not doubt, but upon the first discourse you shall have with him, you will bee encouraged to treat him without any manner of reserve. There is so little

of the Charterhouse, of which he was one, see Macaulay; *Dutch Despatches*, July 8, 11; and 'A Relation of the Proceedings at the Charterhouse.'

<sup>1</sup> August 25, 1687.

<sup>2</sup> From King William's Chest; see also appendix to Dalrymple, part i., book v., p. 82.

alteration here since Monsieur Dickfielt left us, that I can hardly acquaint you with any thing of moment which would be new to you. I have told my L<sup>d</sup> Shrewsbury my thoughts, who is very well able to improve and explaine them to your Highnesse. It is not to bee imagined but that a certaine designe will still go on : all that is to bee hoped is, that it will bee so crippled with the difficulties it every day meeteth with, that it will bee disabled from making so swift a progresse as is necessary for the end it aymeth at. There are some things that can never prevayle upon men's minds, if they have time allowed to consider them ; this may be the present case, the whole kingdome being now so well-informed, that all men are selted in their dislike of the unwelcome thing that is endeavoured to bee imposed on them ; this consideration alone freeth me, in a great measure, from the tears I might otherwise have ; not that it throweth mee into such a security as to make me neglect the means that shall, from time to time, be thought most reasonable for our preservation, towards which your Highnesse seemeth to mee to bee in the best method that can be imagined, in being firme to your true interest, unmoveable in every thing that is essential, and cautious to give no advantage which might, with any colour of reason, bee made use of against you. This conduct being continued, can hardly fayle, there being so many things that concur to make it succeed. I find by Monsieur Zulessem, that your H<sup>se</sup> is inclined to believe there will bee a parliament ; upon which, being encouraged in my good luck in guessing right hitherto upon the same subject, I take the liberty to tell you that I do not think any will bee called, till, by some sudden accident, it shall become necessary and unavoidable : my reasons for it will bee better repeated by my L<sup>d</sup> of Shrewsbury, so that I shall not now give your Highnesse the trouble of them. Wee are full of the news from Hungary, which is not equally welcome to the several Princes in Christendome. Wee think it may have a considerable influence upon this part of the world, and if the season was not too farre advanced, we are apt to beleve France might this very year give some trouble to its neighbours. What part we here might have in it, I cannot tell, but suppose we shall bee slow to ingage in a war, which, besides the expence, to which wee cannot furnish, is lyable to so many accidents, that wee shall not easily bee persuaded to runne the hazard of it. Your Highnesse hath your thoughts intent upon every new thing that ariseth in the world, and knoweth better than any body how to improve every conjuncture, and turne it to the advantage of that interest of which you are the chiefe support ; and as your care and skill will never be wanting, so, I hope, they will meet with their just reward of good successe, which is the top of my wishes, as it is the utmost of my ambition to be serviceable to a Prince to whom I am eternally devoted.

London, Aug 25, 87.

*The same to the same.*<sup>1</sup>

[September 5, 1687.]

1687

Having so lately written to your Highness by my L<sup>d</sup> of Shrewsbury, who is able to give you a particular account of things here, I have nothing to acquaint you with by Monsieur Zulesteyn, who seemeth to deserve the good opinion you have of him, his character agreeing so well with his recommendation, that hee is extremely welcome to all those hee converseth with ; neither is hee wanting to make such observations as may bee useful for your service, by which he layeth a foundation of being so well informed of our matters here, that hee may prove to be a very good instrument to bee further imployed when the occasion shall require it. The King is returned from his progresse as far as Oxford,<sup>2</sup> in his way to the Bath ; and we do not hear that his observations, or his journey, can give him any great encouragement<sup>3</sup> to build any hopes upon, as to the carrying on some things, which appear every day more to bee against the graine. Besides the considerations of conscience, and the publique interest, it is grown into a point of honour, universally received by the nation, not to change their opinion, which will make all attempts to the contrary very ineffectuall. A parliament is still talked of, but I find no cause to alter my judgement in that matter, it being still the same I have already told your Highness, and of which I have desired my L<sup>d</sup> of Shrewsbury to give you some of the reasons that induce mee to it. I have no more to adde, but that I am, and ever will be, unalterably devoted to you.

September 5, 87.

Meanwhile, during the whole of this summer, from the moment that the King's declaration of indulgence had been published, the main anxiety of the Opposition had centred upon the attitude of the Protestant Nonconformists. They had long writhed under the severities of the laws thus summarily suspended ; they had long, on the other hand, contended against the arbitrary encroachments of prerogative, whereof this suspension was so glaring an instance. 'Men who are sore, run to the nearest remedy with too much haste to consider all the consequence ;'<sup>4</sup> and we cannot wonder that the Dissenters did not offer a unanimous exception to the rule. Great exertions, more-

<sup>1</sup> From King William's Chest ; see also appendix to Dalrymple's *Memoirs*, part i., book vi., p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> He reached Oxford, September 3, according to Macaulay, and had there a well-known interview with the refractory Fellows of Magdalen.

<sup>3</sup> See Macaulay, edit. 1858, vol. ii. p. 406, quoting Barillon, September  $\frac{19}{20}$ .

<sup>4</sup> Halifax, *Letter to a Dissenter*.

over, seem to have been made in order to procure from 1687 representatives of the various Dissenting bodies the compliments of formal Addresses. It is even stated, that certain Nonconformists of position, over whom the Government had a hold, were especially active in this service, and forwarded for signature to every part of the kingdom circulars of the most fulsome description. During several months, the publication of loyal Addresses so obtained formed a prominent feature of the 'London Gazette.'

The Opposition, on the other hand, was not idle, and several pamphlets appeared urging the Dissenters, on the part of the Church, to reject the proffered alliance of the Papist King. Of these, the only one now remembered is the famous 'Letter to a Dissenter upon occasion of his Majesties late Gracious Declaration of Indulgence,' which, although signed with the enigmatical initials 'T. W.,'<sup>1</sup> was certainly written by Lord Halifax; and probably, unlike the 'Character of a Trimmer,' published on his own initiative. The authorship of Halifax appears to have been from the first suspected;<sup>2</sup> and significant threats of Westminster Hall showed that the veil of pseudonymity was not altogether unneeded.<sup>3</sup> The pamphlet (described by Sir James Mackintosh as the most perfect example perhaps of a political tract<sup>4</sup>) has evoked from Von Ranke and Macaulay eulogies almost equally impressive; and the former, a very unfriendly critic, considers the Marquis one of the finest pamphleteers that have ever lived.<sup>5</sup> The letter created an immediate and an intense excitement;<sup>6</sup> at least three editions appeared

<sup>1</sup> T[he] Writer'?

<sup>2</sup> See the answers described in introduction to tract, and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiv, part 2, p. 101, Robert Harley to Sir Edward Harley, October 8, 1687: 'The Papists say that the letter to the Dissenters is written by a club. Lord Halifax has "most ink in it."'

<sup>3</sup> See in introduction to tract, in *Works*, the account of an answer called *Remarks upon a Pamphlet*. It is, of course, remembered that the censorship of the press existed. We notice that in February 1688 (six months later) a *proclamation* against the abuse of the press was specially issued (Ralph, i. 981). The terrible fate of 'Julian' Johnson, formerly chaplain to Lord Russell, who, not a year before, had been publicly degraded, pilloried, and flogged from Tyburn to Newgate, for a printed *Appeal to the Army*, also afforded a suggestive warning.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. English Revolution*, p. 174.

<sup>5</sup> *Eng. Gesch.* v. 118.

<sup>6</sup> Von Ranke says it was the earliest attack on the *Declaration*, and praises its appearance at a happy moment. We are inclined to believe it issued from the press about August. One of the answers is dated the middle of September. See also *Hatton Correspondence*, ii. 72 (September 8, 1687): 'Here is lately come out a very seasonable and excellent Letter

1687 within a few months; copies, to the number, as was asserted, of 20,000, circulated throughout the kingdom; and innumerable answers Papist, Nonconformist or Anglican in their respective standpoints, some licensed, some unlicensed—issued for its refutation.<sup>1</sup> In its sage and statesmanlike pages, the danger of an alliance with Rome are forcibly painted; the Nonconformists are exhorted to pause, ere they sacrifice, to a momentary and personal relief, the liberties of their country. They are reminded, that under the reign of the ‘next heir,’ Princess Mary, their reasonable aspirations bid fair to be abundantly satisfied in legal fashion. They are assured, that the Church of England, convinced of her error, has abandoned the attitude of persecution; and that the Protestants, if they offer an unbroken front to Popery, and remain ‘still, quiet and undivided, firm at the same time to [their] Religion, [their] Loyalty, and [their] Laws,’ must win at length, if only by sheer force of numbers.

The effect of the pamphlet upon the Nonconformist mind was extraordinary, as is testified by Baxter, who early recognised the source whence it proceeded. The cautions of Halifax, we are told, ‘were regarded by the wiser part of them, notwithstanding the uncertainty with what Design the Application was made to them;’ and ‘Mr. Baxter . . . and . . . his Brethren in other Places . . . waited in expectation of seeing the Effects of the Marquis’s Declaration on behalf of the Church party.’<sup>2</sup>

The remainder of the year was chiefly remarkable in a political sense for those renewed ‘regulations’ of the Municipalities, the Lieutenancies, and the County Bench, which were designed to facilitate the return of a subservient Parliament. For Lord Halifax, it was unhappily distinguished by fresh domestic troubles. Henry Coventry, we may remark, had survived by only six months his brother William;<sup>3</sup> Henry Savile, the elder, now developed a painful internal malady; and in July, five months after his disgrace, he went to Paris for a surgical operation.<sup>4</sup> On August 16, a few days before the critical date, he wrote a letter to Lord Halifax, which probably proved his last,

of Advice to a Dissenter, writt impartially and with a great deale of witt and strength. They are mightily catched up and are sent farr and neare. . . . I had sent one, but y<sup>e</sup> it is too big to come in a letter.’

<sup>1</sup> See introduction in *Works*.

<sup>2</sup> *Reliquie*.

<sup>3</sup> He seems to have died December 7, 1686 (Bramston, p. 251, from whom *Dictionary of National Biography*: Luttrell).

<sup>4</sup> *Savile Correspondence*, pp. 300–302, July 17, August 16.

and in which he entrusted some commissions to his brother's care; adding, with his usual grace, 'You will pardon all these precise orders, but a sick man is a kind of prince in point of authority, and grows peevish if the whole world does not comply with him; so that, very wisely, we never think ourselves so much masters of the world, as when we are at least in some hazard of leaving it.' The operation was successfully performed, and Lord George Savile, who joined his uncle in Paris during the early part of September,<sup>1</sup> thought him in a fair way of recovery. Complications, however, supervened; and on October 16,<sup>2</sup> he breathed his last. Almost at the same time, died without issue, Lord Eland,<sup>3</sup> eldest son of the Marquis. The breach between father and son had reached such a point, that Lord Halifax, during the preceding year, had forbidden Lord William Savile to visit his brother, then dangerously ill—a severity which Henry Savile had deprecated.<sup>4</sup> Lord Weymouth, however, in condoling with Lord Halifax, declares that the tenderness he had displayed towards his disobedient son had justly acquired for him the reputation of the best father in the world.<sup>5</sup> The death of his brother-in-law, the Earl of Plymouth, which occurred on November 3,<sup>6</sup> must have been a fresh, if a comparatively slight shock to the Marquis, who now retained of the friends and correspondents of his own youth scarce any, save Lord Weymouth. His affections appear to have now completely centred round the son who had become his heir; and whom the elder Henry, in his last letter, had described as the

<sup>1</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (15), September 10, 13.

<sup>2</sup> 'I thinke,' wrote Lord Weymouth to Lord Halifax, October 14, 'y<sup>e</sup> whole Nation partakes with y<sup>e</sup>, for never was man more, nor more deservedly beloved; as to my owne particular, I am scarce capable of receiving a greater blowe, the friend being added to y<sup>e</sup> Relation, w<sup>h</sup> put a Cypher to the Figure, soe y<sup>e</sup> though I can condole w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> I p<sup>r</sup> I assure y<sup>e</sup> I want somebody to comfort me' (*Spencer MSS.* 31 (24)). The actual date of the death is given in *British Museum Add. MSS.* 28,569, ff. 66, 68, from the letters of a Mr. Frazer to Sir R. Southwell. Frazer, the King's physician, a man of wit, and, if we may believe Lord Ailesbury, of some profligacy (*Memoirs*, p. 226), expresses a wish that Savile's letters should be collected. 'He had a very good epistolary talent.'

<sup>3</sup> 'Buried October 11 (*Dutch Despatches*, *British Museum Add. MSS.* 17,677, vol. III, f. 196). He had expired the preceding Saturday.

<sup>4</sup> *Savile Correspondence* pp. 289, 290. It is pretty clear that Lord Eland fell a victim to reckless self-indulgence.

<sup>5</sup> *Spencer MSS.* 31 (24), October 14; 'never Parent was more obliged.'

<sup>6</sup> *British Museum Add. MSS.* 28,569, f. 180. It is unlikely that much sympathy existed between them; as Plymouth had taken the oath as a Privy Councillor within a few days of his brother-in-law's expulsion from the board (*Kennet*, iii. 113).



1687 'second self' of his father. The marriage of the new Lord Eland with Lord Nottingham's niece, a Miss Grimston, which was in treaty at the time of the elder son's death,<sup>1</sup> and took place<sup>2</sup> November 29<sup>3</sup> following, seems to have been the one bright spot in the family prospect. To his young daughter again, the only surviving child of his second marriage, Lord Halifax appears to have been greatly devoted; and for her (not improbably at this very time) he wrote his 'Advice to a Daughter,' which, through the treachery of a scrivener<sup>4</sup> to whom the manuscript had been entrusted for transcription, was published anonymously in the beginning of 1687.<sup>5</sup> This little work, of which the authorship soon became known, attained immense popularity; it ran through between twenty and thirty editions; was translated into both French and Italian, and remained until the advent of Gregory's 'Father's Legacy,' a hundred years later, the orthodox manual for the benefit of young girls. It is probable, indeed, that Lord Halifax shared in this respect the fate of his grandson Lord Chesterfield, and was less remembered during a century for his political gifts, than by the instructions he had formulated for a favourite child. A further parallel may be traced; since the father-in-law of Lady Elizabeth Savile has unkindly recorded his opinion that the parental solicitude of Halifax had been 'labour in vain.'<sup>6</sup>

In style, this little treatise is more finished than the occasional pamphlets of our author; while in brilliancy and sagacity it is surpassed by none. The chapter on 'Religion' affords a curious contrast to the opinions so freely fathered upon the Marquis. That on 'Marriage' is somewhat repulsive to modern taste. The later seventeenth century was not an age of sentiment; and the

<sup>1</sup> Lord Nottingham to Halifax, September 17 and 22, 1687 (letter book, *Spencer MSS.*); Lord Nottingham to Lord Hatton, August 27, 1687 (British Museum Add. MSS. 29,594, f. 57); Lady Nottingham to her father, Lord Hatton, October 22, 1687, misdated in pencil (*ibid.* 29,596, f. 70).

<sup>2</sup> Lie. Vic. Gen., November 24 (Chester, *Westminster Abbey Registers*, p. 234). The bridegroom was about twenty-two, the bride sixteen.

<sup>3</sup> *Dutch Despatches*, November 29, December 9. The lady is said to be an extraordinary heiress (British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. HH, f. 253).

<sup>4</sup> A 'scrivener' was originally, as the etymology of the word suggests, merely a transcriber, especially of legal documents ('one who draws contracts,' Johnson, 'Scrivener' 1). But by the time of Charles II., curiously enough, the scriveners had added to their functions by monopolising, almost entirely, the broking business of the country (Johnson, 'Scrivener' definition 2, 'one whose business is to place money at interest').

<sup>5</sup> See prefatory note in *Works*.

<sup>6</sup> *Walpoliana*, ii. 9, note.

extremely businesslike standpoint from which the contract was usually regarded is faithfully mirrored in the serene cynicism of Lord Halifax. The alternative of a union founded upon mutual attachment is tacitly ignored; 'love,' as in the essays of Bacon and Montaigne, becomes a synonym for sensuality; and it is regarded as practically inevitable, that a woman should begin her married life with at least 'a little aversion.' Nor are the cold-blooded consolations proposed to the wives of unfaithful or intemperate husbands very compatible with warmth of feeling, or even with a sense of delicacy on the part of the lady; while the chapter on friendship is singularly cool.

The sections, however, which turn upon the management of house, family, and servants; on behaviour and conversation; on censure, vanity and affectation; on pride, diversions and dancing, are nearly perfect in their kind, and delight us as much by their witty vivacity as by their shrewd Baconian good sense. The admonitions of Lord Halifax, though addressed to the sex in whose education external graces have ever played so natural and so prominent a part, show hardly a trace of the foppery—intellectual, social and moral—to which the virile understanding of Lord Chesterfield too often stooped. Nor can they be reproached with the laxity which has been made a charge against the celebrated 'Letters.' A captious critic might even insinuate that the Marquis (like other moralists), while arrogating to his own sex a monopoly of intellectual superiority, liberally abandons in favour of the weaker vessel the entire field of the moral duties.

The following letter of compliment belongs to the winter of this year:—<sup>1</sup>

*The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Weymouth.*<sup>2</sup>

London, Jan. 5. 87.

Not to enquire, my dear L<sup>d</sup>, how you got home, nor to wish you a merry Christmas, are omissions never to be justified,

<sup>1</sup> The following rather absurd story is given in *History of William III.* vol. i., part ii., p. 116. 'Several Persons of Quality, particularly the Marquis of Halifax, and the Lords Dorset and Lumley, receiv'd Letters from an Unknown Hand, by which they were threaten'd with sudden Death, unless they should make their Peace with God and the King, by reconciling themselves to the Roman Catholick Church before the beginning of February (1688). But those illustrious Peers laugh'd at the Prediction of those unhallow'd Prophets, and turn'd into Ridicule their visionary way of making Converts.' The anecdote is confirmed by *Dutch Despatches*, February 10, 1687, British Museum Add. MSS. 17,677, vol. III, f. 318.

<sup>2</sup> *Longleat MSS.*, addressed: 'For the right honble The L<sup>d</sup> Viscount Weymouth at Longleat to bee left at Frome Somersetshire.' Seal, arms of Savile impaling Pierrepont, surmounted by coronet.

16<sup>87</sup> and therefore of the two I chuse the lesser fault, which is to send you a letter to no manner of purpose, with nothing to recommend it, or to entertaine you. I have my visitt to Longleat still in my head, and for my own satisfaction will keep it there till I put it in execution. I hope you will at last conclude the matter which brought you up to town upon termes to your satisfaction, and that every thing else may bee so, shall ever bee wished by

my dear L<sup>ds</sup>  
most faithfull humble servant  
HALIFAX.

We must now resume the progress of public affairs, and in especial the course of that political correspondence between the Prince of Orange and the Protestant leaders, initiated by the Dykvelt Embassy. We have already explained, that however distasteful to the English king, this intercourse was in its origin purely constitutional; which character, in the hands of Lord Halifax, is maintained from first to last. As regards his associates, however, the question arises, at what period this correspondence passed into the category of intrigue; where and with whom originated the idea of an armed intervention. The terms in which the proposition was conceived, and the motives by which the action of the Prince was determined, are points of equivalent importance.

As regards the first of these topics,<sup>1</sup> Lord Danby's mysterious letter<sup>2</sup> suggests a possible author: in which case the proposal so foreshadowed may have been formally conveyed to the Prince through Lord Shrewsbury, or one of the other emissaries who, with some affectation of secrecy, conducted the correspondence between the parties during the summer or autumn of 1687. The exact extent of these suggestions, whatever the source whence they proceeded, cannot be adequately gathered from the vague reports of Dr. Burnet: but we incline to believe that the original project contemplated rather an eventual treaty or understanding between the King and the Prince (as champion of the Protestant interest, and husband of the heiress presumptive), than an actual supersession of his Majesty.

<sup>1</sup> Burnet, iii. 275, tells a curious story of a conversation between Mordaunt (Earl of Peterborough in the sequel) and the Prince, which he refers to 1686. But the conversation is so vaguely reported, and the Prince's answer so problematical, that we are disinclined to lay stress on it. The suggestion as to the Princess's *right* seems to refer to the report mentioned in Mazure, ii. 128, 160, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See *ante*, p. 481.

As regards the policy of the Prince himself we shall 162  
 gain our best lights on the subject by reverting to the  
 events of 1680. At that date we find the Stadtholder  
 strongly prepossessed against the policy of Exclusion;  
 and basing his disapproval as much upon the point of  
 morality as upon reasons of political expedience. It was  
 only when convinced by the Sidney-Sunderland alliance  
 that the measure could not be averted, and that a refusal  
 to acquiesce would but strengthen a rival interest, that  
 the Prince had yielded to persuasion. This being the  
 case the following details gain significance: (1) Henry  
 Sidney, who had meanwhile retired to the Continent,  
 gravitated, about the beginning of 1687,<sup>1</sup> towards The  
 Hague, and was one of the most deeply involved in the  
 confidence of the Prince and the leaders. (2) In that  
 section of Burnet's *contemporary* memoirs which was  
 concluded on December 26, 1687, there occurs, some four  
 leaves from the end,<sup>2</sup> a singularly remarkable entry.  
 Burnet, who was then at The Hague, and acting as the  
 Prince's adviser, explicitly suggests that, should the King  
 drive matters to extremity, *the Prince may find himself  
 eventually compelled to interfere in the affairs of Eng-  
 land; since a rebellion of which he should not retain the  
 command would certainly entail a commonwealth.* When  
 we remember the jealousy which William always be-  
 trayed for the English Republican interest, of which he  
 greatly exaggerated the importance,<sup>3</sup> it is difficult to avoid  
 the conclusion that he was urged to the enormous risks  
 involved in his great expedition by a fear lest his stake  
 in this country should be else entirely eliminated, with  
 detrimental effect upon the issues of continental politics.<sup>4</sup>  
 How far his schemes, and the schemes of those in his  
 confidence, were affected by a more obvious factor, the  
 paucity of dates forbids us to say with decision. The  
 entry of Burnet, however, *appears* to have been made ere  
 the Proclamation of December 23<sup>5</sup> confirmed a previous  
 rumour<sup>6</sup> of the English Queen's pregnancy; and Lord

<sup>1</sup> See *Dict. Nat. Bio.*

<sup>2</sup> British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 6,584, f. 342.

<sup>3</sup> By including under this designation the advanced and, as we should say, 'radical' Whigs.

<sup>4</sup> 'Le Prince d'Orange' (says Mazure, ii. 265) 'marchoit froidement, mais constamment, à son but, qui alors' (1687) 'étoit d'humilier la France, d'abattre le parti des Catholiques en Angleterre, et d'assurer la succession de la Couronne à la Princesse sa femme, en se montrant aux peuples comme le protecteur naturel et nécessaire de leur Religion et de leurs libertés.'

<sup>5</sup> Mentioned on the same leaf, but lower down.

<sup>6</sup> Current as early as November 11 (*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xv., part 2, p. 72).

1688 Shrewsbury, one of those most deeply implicated in these proceedings, subsequently assured Lord Halifax<sup>1</sup> that the Stadtholder would have certainly started, had the Prince of Wales never been born.<sup>2</sup>

However this may be, so much at least is certain, that in April, 1688,<sup>3</sup> some weeks before the Queen's delivery,<sup>4</sup> Admiral Russell, a member of the Shrewsbury-Dykvelt circle, went to The Hague, and asked the Prince 'positively' what 'might be expected of him.' The Prince then exclaimed to Dykvelt that it was a case of 'Now or Never,' and gave Russell distinctly to understand, that if invited by some 'men of the best interest . . . to rescue the nation and the religion,' he believed he could be ready by the end of September to come over.<sup>5</sup>

From all these intrigues Lord Halifax held entirely aloof, and continued to advocate resistance on purely constitutional lines. Some tentative overtures from Sidney<sup>6</sup> were very coldly received; and most probably gave occasion to the following remarkable letter, practically contemporaneous in date with the mission of Admiral Russell, and transmitted, we observe, through

<sup>1</sup> Devonshire House 'note book': 'Shrewsbury, Lt. said, March 21, 1690, K. William had come over though the Prince of Wales had never been born.'

<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to believe that William from the first expected to supplant his young nephew, or he would hardly have compromised his standpoint by congratulations on the birth of the infant (Burnet, iii. 240, 241). Strange to say, as early as December 1687 a plot against the crown of King James on the part of the Prince of Orange was suspected by a correspondent of the Pope's secretary, with the horrible addition that the King and his prospective child if a son were to be sacrificed (December 2<sup>nd</sup>, Dalrymple, part i., book v., appendix, p. 125; see also Ranke, vol. v. p. 517 (letter of d'Albeville, spring of 1688); see also d'Avaux, vi. 129, 135, 145, March 1<sup>st</sup>, March 22<sup>nd</sup>, April 1<sup>st</sup>, May 1<sup>st</sup>). The rumours of imposture began early. (See Mackintosh's *Hist. Eng. Rev.* pp. 403-405, quoting an instance of December 8, 1687.) Burnet's contemporary entry (December 26) says that, considering the Queen's ill health, the birth of a living and healthy child would appear 'an extraordinary providence—almost a miracle.'

<sup>3</sup> Burnet says *May*, and is ably corrected by Ralph.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. while the question of the succession, which depended on the sex of the expected infant, was still in suspense.

<sup>5</sup> It would be interesting to know if it is to the Prince or to Burnet that we must ascribe this magnificent 'façon de parler.'

<sup>6</sup> Burnet MS., *Hart. MSS.* 6,584, f. 271a: 'Halifax was tryed at a distance, but he did not encourage a further freedom, and upon general discourse he expressed his dislike of the designe as impracticable, and depending upon so many accidents, that he thought it a needless putting of all things upon so dangerous an Issue.' Burnet's *Hist.* iii. 278: Sydney 'tried' Lord Halifax 'if he would advise the prince's coming over. But, as this matter was opened to him at a great instance, he did not encourage a further freedom. He looked on the thing as impracticable: it depended on so many accidents, that he thought it was a rash and desperate project, that ventured all upon such a dangerous issue, might turn on seas and winds.'

a private channel. From its tenor it is equally clear that Lord Halifax suspected the existence of a Forward Party, and that he was by no means aware how far the Prince stood committed. We mark by the use of italics the most significant passages.

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.<sup>1</sup>*

I avoid giving your H[ighne]sse unnecessary trouble, and though this hath a good conveyance, yet it may, perhaps, bee so long in its way to you, that it will not bee pertinent to repeat what you will have had from other hands. There hath been little that is new this great while, since either the old methods have continued, or else what appeareth to bee new, is at least not strange, being produced by a naturall consequence, and therefore to bee reasonably expected and foreseen. In some particulars, to men at a distance, the engine seemeth to moove fast, but by looking neerer, one may see it not stirre upon the whole matter, so that *here is a rapid motion without advancing a step, which is the onely miracle that church hath yet shewed to us. Every attempt turneth back upon them. They change the magistracy in the corporations, and still for the worse, as to their own designs. The irregular methods have spent themselves without effect; they have runne so fast that they begin to bee out of breath, and the exercise of extraordinary powers, both ecclesiastical and civill, is so farre from firing the right of them, that men are more united in objecting to them. The world is still where it was, with this onely difference, that it groweth every day more averse to that which is endeavoured to bee imposed upon them.* The very Papists who have estates act unwillingly like pressed men, and have such an eye to what may happen in a revolution,<sup>2</sup> that their present advantages hardly make amends for their fears; upon the whole, they are so divided between the fear of losing their opportunity by delay, or spoyling it with too much haste, that their steps are wavering and uncertaine,<sup>3</sup> and distrusting the very instruments they use, they are under great mortifications, notwithstanding the appearance of carrying everything without opposition. Being thus discouraged by

<sup>1</sup> From King William's Chest; see also Dalrymple, part i., book v., appendix, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> See Burnet, iii. 217, 219; Dartmouth's note on Burnet, iii. 229. Barillon to Louis, March 1685, quoted by Mazure, i. 404. See also an extremely valuable extract in ii. 252, with many similar passages in the same history; and the quotation from Johnstone, Mackintosh, p. 218.

<sup>3</sup> Adda, British Museum Add. MSS. 15,397. At f. 59 (May 14) occurs a remarkable report of a conversation with Sunderland. 'He said, moreover, naming some of these principal leaders, as Milord Alifax, and even some of the Courtiers, that they said his Majesty would never succeed in his schemes, and they had only to remain firm until the inevitable breach with the Nonconformists should take place, and then his Majesty must needs have recourse to them, that is to the Anglicans, and matters would go as they wished.' Sunderland had no doubt they were mistaken in their perverse expectation.

1688 their ill successes in their attempts, some say they are altering their scheme, and not finding their expectations answered by the Dissenters, they have thoughts of returning to their old friends, the high Church men;<sup>1</sup> but the truth is, the Papists have of late been so hard and fierce upon them, that the very species of those formerly mistaken men is destroyed; they have so broken that loom in pieces, that they cannot now set it up againe to work upon it: *In the mean time the men at the helme are certainly divided amongst themselves,*<sup>2</sup> which will produce great effects, if men will let it work, and not prevent the advantages that may be expected, by being too unquiet, or doing things out of season; the great thing to be done now, is to do nothing, but wait for the good consequences of their divisions and mistakes. *Unseasonable stirrings, or anything that looketh like the Protestants being the Aggressors, will tend to unite them, and by that means will be a disappointment to those hopes, which otherwise can hardly joyle: Nothing, therefore, in the present conjuncture can be more dangerous than unskilful Agitators, warm men who would be active at a wrong time, and want patience to keep their zele from running away with them.*<sup>3</sup> It is said by some, that there is an intention of making a new attempt to beget a better understanding with your Highness; that in order to it, the present Envoy,<sup>4</sup> as lesse acceptable, is to be removed, and another sent, who, if he should be less known, may, perhaps, for that very reason, be the more dangerous. If this should be true, and that softer proposals should be made from hence, it will deserve all your caution to receive them so as neither to give advantage by rejecting them too roughly on one side, or on the other, by giving any colour for them to pretend there is a consent given to any thing that may be inconvenient. After the reports raised here, without any manner of ground, first of your Highness being a Papist,<sup>5</sup> then of your being desirous to have the test repealed,<sup>6</sup> there is nothing of that kind which may not be thought possible; so that if there should now be any nearer treaty, it might, perhaps, be made use of with more advantage by them, to mislead men at a distance into a wrong belief. In lower instances, it hath not been

<sup>1</sup> See Mackintosh, 217.

<sup>2</sup> For the split between Petre and Sunderland during the spring, see Mackintosh, *Hist. Rec.* pp. 219, 228, 229, and the authorities there cited.

<sup>3</sup> One of these 'warm men' (Johnstone, *cousin and correspondent* of Burnet) described Halifax eight days before the date of the letter as in the throes of 'a war between his constitution and his judgment' (quoted Mackintosh, p. 217).

<sup>4</sup> White, called the Marquis d'Albeville. (For the character of this worthless and incapable adventurer, see Mazure.)

<sup>5</sup> For the report that he meditated a change of faith (a report occasioned by certain overtures on this head from James) see Mazure, ii. 345, June 1687, from the *French Despatches*. Dykvelt had to deny the report that William was a Papist (Burnet).

<sup>6</sup> These had necessitated the publication of Fagel's letter. (See Burnet, Ralph, Mazure, ii. 352, &c.)

unusuall, in such cases, to set proposals on foot, of which no other effect is expected, than to bring men under doubts and suspicions from their own friends.<sup>1</sup> The instruments that shall bee made use of, their interests and dependencies being well considered and examined, will give a great deal of light, if anything of this kind should bee attempted; and it *happeneth well, that they will have to do with one who knoweth so well how to judge of men and things, as not to be within the danger of being easily surprized, neither by any upon this occasion, nor by any other of our countrymen who speak what is dictated to them by men of severall interests, or endeavour to value themselves upon their correspondencies and influences here, which, I doubt, have seldome foundation strong enough for your H[ighne]sse to build upon.*<sup>2</sup> There can bee nothing better recommended to you, than the continuance of the method which you practise; neither to comply in anything that is unfit, nor to provoke further anger by any act that is unnecessary. This will not, perhaps, bee sufficient to prevent ill-will, but it will, in a great measure, secure you from the ill effects of it. Your H[ighne]sse must allow mee to applaud my good fortune in not having hitherto made a wrong conjecture about the sitting of the parliament: Notwithstanding the discourses that have been made by the Great men, with the greatest assurance, that it would meet one time after another, I ever thought it impracticable, considering the measures that are taken, and I am now<sup>3</sup> as much an unbeliever for October, as I was for April, which was the time prefixt for the meeting;<sup>4</sup> with all this your H[ighne]sse must expect, that it will still bee given out, there will bee one; it is not, perhaps, thought convenient, neither indeed would it bee so, that all foreeign Princes and States should conclude, there never will be a parliamen[t] in England in this K's reign; a great deal would depend upon such an opinion received, which would have an influence upon their manner of treating with us; but according to the most rationall conjecture, *how extraordinary soever many things may appear which have been done, the letting a p[ar]liamen[t] meet as matters now stand, would so undo them all, that it is hardly to bee supposed possible.* The other great point which at present maketh the discourse is,

<sup>1</sup> This probably alludes to the story told on p. 469, *ante*.

<sup>2</sup> This may allude to Burnet or to Sidney.

<sup>3</sup> 'In private [Halifax] mentioned, as one of the reasons of his opinion, that some of the courtiers had declined to take up a bet for five hundred pounds, which he had offered, that the Parliament would not meet in October; and that, though they liked him very little, they liked his money as well as any other man's' (Mackintosh, p. 225, quoting Johnstone, February 27, 1688).

<sup>4</sup> During this spring, some of the Papists urged James to follow up his orders for the recall of the English troops in the Dutch service, and 'profiter de l'étonnement des factieux pour assembler un Parlement au mois de mai, et surtout des espérances' of a direct heir. Sunderland defeated this proposal (Mazure, ii 399, 400).



1688 whether England will have a warre with the States; <sup>1</sup> in this, the more thinking sort of men are of opinion there will bee none. There is disposition enough for it, for reasons which need not to bee explained; but there are so many discouraging circumstances, and the prejudice from ill success would bee so much greater than the utmost which can bee hoped in case of prospering, that the men in power must go against all the common methods of arguing, if they venture upon an experiment which may be so destructive to them. I have tired your H[ighness] so long, that it is time for me to close with my wishes for your own and the Princesses's health, which are of that consequence to the world, that nothing can bee desperate whilst you are well and safe. For my self, I must ever be unalterably devoted to you.

London, April 12, 88.

The purely defensive attitude adopted by Halifax during the course of these critical negotiations has excited from modern writers some very invidious reflections. Dalrymple <sup>2</sup> affixes to Lord Halifax the certainly inappropriate stigma of a 'learned indolence;' and Macaulay directly assumes that the Marquis sympathised with projects for which he refused to compromise his safety. Lord Halifax, so the historian insinuates, <sup>3</sup> 'was ready to oppose the Court to the utmost in the House of Lords and by means of anonymous writings; but he was little disposed to exchange his lordly repose for the insecure and agitated life of a conspirator, to be in the power of accomplices, to live in constant dread of warrants and King's messengers, nay, perhaps to end his days on a scaffold, or to live on alms in some back street of the Hague;' and Lord Macaulay proceeds to describe the

<sup>1</sup> The friction created, January to April 1688, by the peremptory recall of the English troops in the Dutch service, with the remonstrances of the States, may be studied at length in Ralph and Mazure. 'Les uns, entre autres les lords Powes et Arundel, regardoient ce rappel des régiments comme une rupture formelle avec les Etats Généraux, et surtout avec le prince d'Orange. Ils proposoient donc de l'ajourner jusqu'au moment où l'on sauroit bien ce que l'on pouvoit espérer d'un Parlement.' Sunderland, on the other hand, pressed the recall, as a means of soldering the alliance between England and France, which had secretly promised to pay for 'the troops if continued in the service of England, and of which Sunderland was himself the pensioner (Mazure, ii. 371-380). A war, however, appeared imminent (*ibid.* p. 378), and Holland armed (p. 384). The demand was refused (p. 386). James, who dared not call a Parliament for supply, vacillated, and the States remained masters of the situation (pp. 405-412). In May, Spain thought a breach inevitable if the combatants meant what they said (*Coleccion . . . por el Marqués de la Fuensanta de Valle*, lxxix. 434, 437).

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, edit. 1790, part 1, book v., p. 24. Elsewhere (*ibid.* p. 17) he twits him 'with that indetermination of spirit which commonly makes literary men of no use to the world.'

<sup>3</sup> *History*, edit. 1858, vol. ii. p. 350.

statesman as a 'sceptic, . . . a voluptuary, . . . a man 1688 not likely to venture his all on a single hazard, or to be a martyr in any cause.' If we dissent from the epithet of 'voluptuary,' which indeed is singularly unfortunate,<sup>1</sup> there is much in the above description which obviously hits the mark. We have already hinted our belief that the Marquis—in the event of Repeal—intended to abandon the contest, and withdraw to a continental retirement; and if we refrain from asserting that despite the nerve, audacity and decision which he displayed at moments of crisis,<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax was 'not of the stuff of which martyrs are made,' it is solely because we are conscious that martyrs are actually fashioned of very various material. Had fate ended his career amid the grim paraphernalia of Tower Hill, Lord Halifax would doubtless have met the inevitable with cool and philosophic fortitude; but we conceive he was decidedly desirous to avoid, so far as honour and decency permitted, that very unpleasant consummation; and was equally unwilling to compromise the stately edifice of the family fortunes, and to risk the interests of his best-beloved son.

Assuming, however, that Lord Halifax set bounds to his national enthusiasm, and pronounced to his patriotic energy 'thus far shalt thou go and no further'—we are not justified in maintaining that his views of the actual situation were coloured by personal predilection. He had argued from first to last, that the salvation of the country could be secured by a purely Passive Resistance;<sup>3</sup> the breach which he regarded as fatal had never been made in the bulwarks; and the constitutional *status quo* remained entirely unaltered. The various arbitrary acts in favour of the Roman Catholic communion were obvious

<sup>1</sup> The tastes of Halifax, though tending to magnificence in his household economy, appear to have been, from a personal point of view, of the simplest description. The plainness of his attire was a matter of good-natured banter among his friends (*Savile Correspondence*, pp. 70, 118, 122) &c. We gather that he was regarded as abstemious in his habits; and though once a year, together with Lords Mulgrave, Dorset, Danby, 'Mr. Dryden, and others of that set of men,' he supped with the good Duke of Ormonde, 'and then they were merry and drank hard' to the extent of at least a bottle apiece (Carte's *Ormonde*, iv. 699), he expressed the heartiest contempt for the fashionable vice of drunkenness. His, at least comparative, freedom from other yet more fashionable vices (see *ante*, p. 31, note 1) was a matter for satirical comment among the ribald wits of the age (see *ante*, p. 191, note).

<sup>2</sup> As during the Exclusion Crisis; at the crisis of the Revolution; and during the attacks of the 'Murder Committee' in 1689.

<sup>3</sup> See the letters to Lord Chesterfield; *Letter to a Dissenter*; correspondence with the Prince of Orange.

1688 and admitted infringements of existing and unquestionable statutes; the fabric could not survive a Parliamentary enquiry; and though the ill-judged liberality of Parliament had rendered James in the ordinary course of affairs independent, a war, or prolonged maintenance of a standing military establishment, must have reduced him to absolute poverty. Nay, more; the King was well aware that, however he might stave off the evil, an eventual demise of the Crown, in favour of his daughter and her husband, must sound the death knell of the plans he had matured with such anxious solicitude. The contingency, moreover, appeared by no means remote, for though James, by thirteen years, survived his impending deposition, he was even at the time of which we write a man verging upon sixty, of decidedly impaired constitution.<sup>1</sup> Under such circumstances, there is very much to be said for the policy of calm anticipation so strongly urged by the Marquis. Nor could the mere possibility of a change in the order of succession introduce a decisive factor into the state of the political situation; as everything, of course, depended on the sex of the expected infant. Moreover, in the last resort, the birth of a presumably Popish heir, however severe a disappointment to the minds of all thinking Protestants, could not be regarded as involving a constitutional catastrophe. The successive deaths of six among the eight children born to the Duke of York had inspired a general belief (half superstitious, half rational) in a fatality attending his offspring; and Lord Halifax evidently shared the widely prevalent impression that the heir, if actually born, would not survive to manhood.<sup>2</sup> Yet, even admitting that event, the crisis seemed

<sup>1</sup> Bonrepaux, a French envoy, pointed out in 1687, while Mary was still heiress-presumptive, that the precarious health of the King made the ministers feel as if William were already at the gates of London to demand an account of them. He added that the wildest rumours circulated as to his Majesty's health, but that, although his constitution was not altogether sound, there was no reason against his living for years (*Mazure*, ii. 280, 281).

<sup>2</sup> See Halifax to the Prince, given below (p. 510), July 25, 1688, and accompanying note. See also a remarkable letter from Melfort to James, October 1689. 'The prince of Wales . . . thrives. This was looked on as impossible, and was the strongest argument to join with that prince, whom, they thought, would, sooner or later be their master, and use them as they should now do him' (*Macpherson*, i. 336). To Halifax this represented an additional argument against a forcible revolution. See also a curious passage in Mackintosh, p. 127, from the MS. of Sheridan, Tyrconnel's secretary, which shows that Tyrconnel, in 1686, regarded the succession of Orange as imminent, in consequence of the King's declining age, and the improbability that the Queen's children, if ever she had any, should live beyond infancy. It is a curious fact, not generally noticed, that immediately

merely postponed, for it was regarded as more than doubtful whether James could live to see his son's majority; and the King himself believed that, should he die ere his son came of age, the grandes of the kingdom, obtaining possession of the young monarch, would breed him in the Protestant religion.<sup>1</sup> In any case, however, the lapse of the Parliamentary revenues, consequent on the death of the King, must have rendered Parliament at length master of the political situation.

Nor is it open to dispute that the attitude of purely constitutional opposition, so long as it offered prospect of success, was strongly preferable, from every point of view. To defend a legal position by expedients which are entirely illegal, is a policy which, in the interests of Law and Order, must be kept for the last resort; and men do well who deprecate the Ordeal of Civil War.

The motives which impelled the Prince to a direct and summary interference in the affairs of England, however cogent in themselves, bore, as we have already asserted, no reference to the interests of this country. But considerable importance attaches to two arguments for immediate action, upon which the signatories of the subsequent invitation laid a peculiar stress. The municipal corporations of the kingdom had been manipulated<sup>2</sup> with the most unscrupulous partiality in hopes of securing the votes of the urban electorate, which returned, after all, the majority of the Parliamentary representatives; and though Lord Halifax was probably correct in his anticipation that even these tactics would not have procured a Parliament sufficiently pliable for the purposes of the government,<sup>3</sup> the policy if steadily pursued during the twelve years for which James actually survived, and reinforced by the lavish creation of Peers, which the King was understood to contemplate,<sup>4</sup> might have very

after the marriage of William and Mary, her succession had appeared indefinitely postponed by the birth of a brother (November 7, 1677), to whom William stood godfather, and who died a month later (Keeney, iii. 360).

<sup>1</sup> Mazure, ii. 438, 439, probably from Barillon. Even Sunderland is believed to have calculated on the probability of a Regency. After the Revolution appeared a Jacobite pamphlet (*Somers Tracts*, x. 536, 537), in which the King's age, and consequent possibility of a minority, are canvassed from the Jacobite standpoint. It is assumed that a Restoration, during the minority, would lead to the education of the young king in the Protestant faith.

<sup>2</sup> Of which Reresby gives a good account (pp. 386-394).

<sup>3</sup> See Mackintosh's *History of the English Revolution*, pp. 193, 194.

<sup>4</sup> Adda, October 11, 1686, September 10, 1688. See also Halifax 'note book,' Devonshire House: 'L<sup>d</sup> Sunderland said at his table that rather

1688 effectually destroyed the efficacy of the Parliamentary system.

Again the existence of the army was a very ominous factor. So far indeed, as the event conclusively showed, the troops were strongly imbued by a Protestant and national spirit.<sup>1</sup> But the labours of twelve years, and the introduction of foreign or Irish mercenaries,<sup>2</sup> might have produced a military organisation entirely dependent on the prerogative, and biassed against institutions, which it might conceive unfavourable to its maintenance.<sup>3</sup> We may doubt, however, whether to this task the financial resources of James would have proved themselves equal, in the long run.

A third argument, adduced by the authors of the invitation, need not detain us, since Lord Halifax never doubted the birth of the Prince of Wales.<sup>4</sup>

We must now, however, return to events in their chronological order, for a sudden crisis was at hand such as none of the parties expected. On April 27,<sup>5</sup> about a fortnight after the date of the letter on which we have dilated, appeared the *second* Declaration of Indulgence, whereof, as it recapitulated in express terms the *first* declaration, the motive is not very clear.<sup>6</sup> A week or ten

than not gain the majority of the House of Lords, if hee was the K. hee would create Lt Feversham's troop Peers.' Dartmouth, who gives the story, in his note on Burnet, on Lord Bradford's authority, puts Churchill for Feversham.

<sup>1</sup> This is, of course, admitted in the final *Invitation*.

<sup>2</sup> Beresby (p. 402) gives a good account of the attempt to introduce Irish recruits into Berwick's regiment.

<sup>3</sup> 'We do much doubt,' (i.e. fear) 'whether this present state of things will not yet be much changed to the worse before another year, by a great alteration which will probably be made both in the officers and soldiers of the army, and by such other changes as are not only to be expected from a jacked parliament, but what the meeting of any parliament . . . may produce against . . . obstructors . . . ; it being taken for granted that if things cannot then be carried to their wishes in a parliamentary way, other measures will be put in execution by more violent means; [which] . . . will prevent all possible means of relieving ourselves. These considerations make us of opinion, that this is a season in which we may more probly contribute to our own safeties than hereafter, *although we must own, to your Highness there are some judgements differing from our own in this particular*' (*Invitation* [the italics are our own]; Dalrymple, part i. book v. appendix, pp. 108, 109).

<sup>4</sup> See below, vol. ii. p. 7. The question as to the real belief of those who sanctioned the story is very difficult. There was certainly much to excite suspicion; but the absence of any inquiry after the Revolution suggests that the movers were really convinced that the Prince was not supposititious. Lord Ailesbury declares that William himself described him as the son of his father and mother.

<sup>5</sup> So Macaulay. Plumptre (*Life of Ken*, i. 293) says April 25.

<sup>6</sup> The additional paragraph will be found in Ralph, i. 983; or Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, i. 294. See, for the various motives which have been conjectured, Macaulay, Plumptre, Barillon (in Mazure, ii. 438), Ranke, Adda (British Museum Add. MSS. 15,397, f. 76).

days later, however,<sup>1</sup> issued the Order in Council, which 1688 directed that the Declaration should be read on two successive Sundays in the churches and chapels of the kingdom.<sup>2</sup>

The conference of the London clergy, which determined to disobey the Order in Council; the episcopal meetings at Lambeth, May 12 and 18; and the presentation at ten o'clock on the evening of the 18th of the petition in which the seven bishops defended a definite refusal, have been described at length by historians,<sup>3</sup> and need not detain us. Nor is it difficult to realise how bitterly King James was mortified by the unexpected firmness of the Episcopate. It is said indeed that during the next day he frequently adverted to a warning once received from Lord Halifax: 'your father suffered for the church, [and] not the church for [your father].'<sup>4</sup>

That Lord Halifax was not consulted by the bishops appears certain. Their confidant, however (Lord Clarendon), seems to have discussed the question with the Marquis,<sup>5</sup> as the Earl complains, 'I confess I do not understand his Lordship's notions: I am sure, when the reading the declaration was under consideration, and the petition for which the Bishops now suffer, he was so very cautious, that he would give no advice at all.'

Von Ranke twice<sup>7</sup> refers to this passage as a proof of the political supineness with which he charges the Marquis; but this censure omits two considerations, both of decided importance. In the first place, there is reason to believe that Halifax preferred to decline confidential relations with Lord Clarendon. Lord Rochester and the Marquis had long been upon terms of estrangement, and the protracted submission of the two brothers to the policy of James can hardly have failed to excite the contempt of Savile. Between Halifax and Lord Clarendon,

<sup>1</sup> May 1. We may mention that the *Character of a Trimmer* was first published at this time in the name of Coventry. (See prefatory note in *Works*.) On May 10, 1688, Lord Chesterfield sent a copy to a friend, observing that in his opinion the *Character* 'will admit of more than once reading, and is applicable as well to these times, as to those of the late king, which were but the infancy of what we now see is almost grown to gigantic proportions' (*Letters*, p. 331).

<sup>2</sup> May 20 and 27 being the days prefixed for the metropolis, June 3 and 10 for the provinces.

<sup>3</sup> Most recently by Plumptre, *Life of Ken*.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Mackintosh (p. 250) from Van Citters (*Dutch Despatches*).

May '82  
June '1.

<sup>5</sup> He called on Halifax May 18, the day after the first Lambeth conference (*Diary*, ii. 172).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 176 (June 12).

<sup>7</sup> Vol. v. pp. 451, 461.

1688 moreover, a personal difference impended;<sup>1</sup> and in fine the attitude of the statesmen was regarded as one of hostility. In the second place, Macaulay asserts<sup>2</sup> that Halifax and Lord Nottingham, the oracle of the Moderate High Churchmen, having been consulted on the point by some of the beneficed clergy, opined that no sufficient interval remained for concerted action; and that mere spasmodic disobedience, on the part of individuals, would, by exposing such individuals to ruin, do more harm than good.<sup>3</sup>

In the event, however, upon May 20, the first day appointed for the reading in the metropolis, only four out of about a hundred City clergymen read the declaration. On the 27th a similar result ensued. James, thus foiled and exasperated, formed the fatal resolution of indicting for libel the episcopal instigators of this resistance. Summoned on May 28, they appeared before the Council on June 8; and the birth of the King's son and heir followed by only a few hours their committal to the Tower, upon a refusal to enter into recognisances.<sup>4</sup>

Within the next few days Lord Halifax called upon the imprisoned Prelates, 'and advised them to write every one to three peers to be bail for them when they came to the King's bench; which they said they did not like, and seemed not inclined to do it.'<sup>5</sup> It is probable that the Marquis had a second errand, and that he then laid before the bishops the following very remarkable

<sup>1</sup> Halifax had been consulted by the Queen Dowager with regard to a suit at law between her and Lord Clarendon. The latter fancied that the Marquis, while outwardly civil and anxious for an accommodation between the parties, afforded little support to his pretensions; and it is evident that this circumstance both affected their relations, and caused Clarendon to regard the Marquis in an unfavourable light. Of the merits of the case it is, of course, impossible to judge (Clarendon, *Diary*, ii. 154-158, 162, 163, 168, 170, January April 28, 1688).

<sup>2</sup> We presume he quotes Johnstone. (See Mackintosh, p. 244. Johnstone, May 27: 'Halifax and Nottingham wavered at first, which had almost ruined the business.')

<sup>3</sup> This fact seems to weigh strongly against the supposition that Halifax can have written the *Letter from a Clergyman*. The question is discussed later on. It is also manifest that the defence of the penal laws in the *Letter* is a strong argument against the authorship of Halifax. Peresby, upon whom he called just before the committal of the bishops, found him 'willing to consent to liberty of conscience, but not to take away the test and not all the penal laws together, but gradually, and upon good considerations' (June 1, p. 395).

<sup>4</sup> They took their stand upon the privilege of their peerage. Plumptre considers this an almost malicious technicality, intended to force the King's hand. (But see the Halifax petition below; and Gutch, i. 344-349.) They acted upon legal advice.

<sup>5</sup> Clarendon, *Diary*, ii. 176 (afternoon of June 12).

petition, found among the Devonshire House Papers, 1688 which does not appear to have been presented. We should imagine that Lord Halifax had intended a subsequent publication as an appeal to the people.

*Draught of a Petition &c. [from the Bishops to K. James, in the year 168 (sic) by the Marquis of Halifax].<sup>1</sup>*

It is not so much ye weight of our Sufferings as that of your displeasure which moveth us in all Submission to offer to y<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> that the proceedings in our case are such as may deserve your further and more gracious Reflection.

We must first beg leave to say, S<sup>r</sup>, that we are very unfortunate, to have that imputed to us as a Crime, of which the Omission, would in our iudgement, have been an offence; for having received your Ma<sup>ty's</sup> orders to distribute &c. it lay upon us as an indispensable duty either to give our obedience, or our reasons, why we could not comply.

We must therefore own, we have not yet recover'd our surprise, that a most humble and well meant petition, should be imputed to us as a Seditious Libel; and that what we conceiv'd to be a necessary act of our duty to prevent your Ma<sup>ty's</sup> displeasure, should draw it so severely upon us.

Could we find in the whole course of our Lives one Libelling thought in our hearts against your Ma<sup>esty</sup> wee our selves should be the first that would arraign it. And give us leave to say S<sup>r</sup>, it is strange, that we who have been so often libell'd four our adhering to the Crown, should now act so differing a part and so unnatural to us, as not only to make a Libel against your Ma<sup>ty</sup>, but with the aggravation of presenting it to yourself too.

S<sup>r</sup>, Our Principles, our Practise, and your own Royal Testimony of our Loyaltie, do speak so much for it, that they seem to us to be evidences in our behalf, beyond Contradiction; so that we hope, your Ma<sup>ty</sup> must believe, that we can never have any motives to restrain our compliyanee that ought to give your Majesty just cause of offence.

For we may say, that where we cannot reconcile our opinions to your commands, the affliction it giveth us, is of it self a sufficient proof, that our Refusal cannot be a Crime.

Your Ma<sup>ty</sup> will be pleas'd to allow, that where upon a serious and impartial debate within our selves, the objections that occurr are too strong for us to answer and suppress, we must unavoidably yield to the dictates of our own consciences, • that have a jurisdiction over us, from which, according to our Religion, we can have no Appeal;

We have not been wanting to use the best means to direct our judgements so as not to err in a thing of this importance; and though we are ever strongly biass'd by our desires to obey your Ma<sup>ty</sup> yet in this case, S<sup>r</sup> besides other Arguments, we

<sup>1</sup> From a clerical copy among the Devonshire House MSS. The passage in brackets is added in another hand.



1688 consider'd what hath been declared upon this Subject at several times, by votes and Otherways in Parl<sup>t</sup>.

First his late Ma<sup>ty</sup> solemn assurance to both houses,<sup>1</sup> that his declaration for liberty of Conscience should not be drawn into consequence or Example. After that, the acquainting th<sup>e</sup> houses by his Order, that the said declaration was cancell'd, and in consequence of this, the thanks of the houses voted, as for a full and Entire answer.

We remember'd the Votes and Addresses of the last house of Commons, and particularly of what then pass'd in the house of L<sup>ds</sup>, of which we have the honour to be Members, where the Sense of the house appear'd so visibly, that your Ma<sup>ty</sup> did not think it necessary to stay for their declaring their opinion by a Vote, having then been pleased to prorogue the Parl<sup>t</sup> before the day to which the debate was adjourn'd.<sup>2</sup>

These considerations, S<sup>r</sup> must needs have their weight with us, and we beg your Ma<sup>ty</sup> would graciously be pleased to reflect, in what capacity, and under what Obligations we are in this case;

First, as Bps it is not justifiable for us to venture upon doing any Act, whilst there remaineth any doubt or Scruple in our minds, that it may be in any degree a prejudice to the Church;

Secondly, As Peers of Parl<sup>t</sup> it is a tender thing for us to do anything, which may by any reasonable construction give the house of Peers distaste and matter of objection to us, Since anything of that kind might perhaps be more severely imputed to us, than it would be to those who are Peers of inheritance; besides, how can we answer it to our Selves, or to the world, to give order for the publishing a declaration of Indulgence, against which as it is extended, we were ready to address, if by letting the last Parl<sup>t</sup> sit your Ma<sup>ty</sup> had given time for it, and we conceive it very incongruous for us to do any Act to promote a thing so opposite to that which was then our opinion and which hitherto is not alter'd.

Thirdly, We think ourselves obliged to suit our behaviour to your Ma<sup>ty</sup>'s promise, and since you have been pleased so often and so solemnly to give your Royal word that you will Support the Church of England, *as it is by Law Established* whilst we, with all Submission, apprehend that the reading the Said declaration is not the natural or proper means to that end, we should make ourselves guilty towards your Ma<sup>ty</sup>, by doing an Act which in our Opinion might make your promise less effectual.

S<sup>r</sup>, We presume that your Ma<sup>ty</sup> by your discerning Judgment, and by the means which have been used to know the minds of your Subjects in this particular, must be sensible, that we are not singular in this opinion which is now imputed as a Crime to us; and we assure our Selves, that you will yet be more fully convinced of it, at the meeting of the Parl<sup>t</sup>, in November or Sooner, according to your Ma<sup>ty</sup>'s late resolution publish'd to that effect; It is there S<sup>r</sup>, your Ma<sup>ty</sup> will have the truest

<sup>1</sup> In 1673. (See *ante*, p. 104.)    <sup>2</sup> November 1685. (See *ante*, pp. 458, 459.)

information, how far the proceedings against us have been regularly pursued; <sup>1</sup> and there also we shall have the opportunity of showing how far we are from being averse to a fair Liberty of Conscience for Protestant Dissenters, which may have this happy effect, that however your Protestant subjects may be otherwise divided in their opinions, they may by a healing Law be so united in their affections, that they may be unanimous in their duty to your Ma<sup>ty</sup> &c. and in their Zeal to promote the peace and security of the kingdom. 1688

For ourselves Sr, having lay'd these things before you, whatever becometh of us, we shall pray that your Ma<sup>ty's</sup> greatness may be out of the reach of fortune that it may be built upon a Safe and a lasting foundation, and that it may be confirm'd and crowned with the affections of your people. The greatest blessing God can give, or can be ask'd for you by—<sup>2</sup>

That the bishops should have refrained from presenting so politely exasperating a petition appears to us, we confess, strong evidence of their good judgment.

On the first day of term, the bishops were brought before the Court of King's Bench. The suggestion of Halifax had been taken; in case securities might be required, three Peers were prepared to answer for each prelate.<sup>3</sup> Halifax, with his son-in-law Carbery, and another, should have been bound for the Bishop of St. Asaph. But though a majority of the judges decided that a Peer is not exempt from entering into recognisances under the circumstances of the case,<sup>4</sup> their own recognisances were deemed sufficient.

The trial, on June 29 and 30, has been described in Macaulay's most brilliant manner. The Marquis was conspicuous among the twenty-nine Peers who lent the support of their sympathy to the defendants,<sup>5</sup> while his

<sup>1</sup> Mazure (ii. 116, 448), following Barillon, points out how extremely the peerage of the bishops complicated the proceedings against them, since any irregularity, and in especial any decision of the Ecclesiastical Commission (before which it had been proposed to summon them), was certain to be highly resented by the House of Lords.

<sup>2</sup> At the foot: 'This is a true copy from the Marquis of Halifax's own hand, written, corrected, and Interlined by himself.' Endorsement (on another hand): 'Petition from the Bishops to K. James, 1688. By Lord Halifax.'

<sup>3</sup> See a list made by the Bishop of London, and corrected by Sancroft (Gutch, i. 356), with the list of peers actually in court (Kennet, iii. 484). Only two of the twenty-one seem to have been absent. Clarendon was suggested by Compton as the third for St. Asaph. Sancroft crased him, probably knowing that he disapproved the plan. As an alternative to Carbery he suggested Lord 'Bullingbrook.'

<sup>4</sup> The question is abstruse. Mackintosh quotes the high authority of Lord Camden in Wilkes's case for a contrary decision (p. 263).

<sup>5</sup> Olduixon, who places him first on his list (*History of England during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart*, p. 738).

1688 brother-in-law, Lord President Sunderland, who, a few days earlier, had professed his adhesion to the Roman Communion,<sup>1</sup> appeared as the reluctant witness for a prosecution, which his shrewdness had deprecated in vain. The critical moment came at last; and a contemporary<sup>2</sup> records how, as the words *Not guilty* passed the lips of the foreman of the jury, 'the Marquis of Halifax waving his Hat over his Head cry'd Huzzah! The Lords and Gentlemen took the shout from him. It in an instant fill'd the whole Hall with the loudest Acclamations of Joy, which were immediately taken again by the Crouds waiting in Palace-Yard and in Westminster; from whence like a Roll and Roar of Thunder, it was carry'd in and thro' the City of London, and spread over the Parts adjacent, and as fast as it could fly, over the whole Kingdom.'<sup>3</sup>

That night, while the nation was in a ferment of delight at the result of the trial, seven men assembled, probably at Lord Shrewsbury's; and there Sidney, the kinsman of Halifax; Shrewsbury, his former ward; Compton, Bishop of London, to whom he had acted as counsellor; Lord Danby, his lifelong rival; Lord Devonshire and Admiral Russell of the old Exclusion party; and Lundey, who had always ranked among the assertors of prerogative, set their cyphers (in accordance with the Stadtholder's demand) to the celebrated invitation,<sup>4</sup> wherein, without defining the object of their manœuvres, or the capacity in which the Prince is to act, but with the assertion, that nineteen-twentieths of the people are desirous of 'a change,' they request his Highness to give,

<sup>2</sup> This fact (for which see Mazure, ii. 463, evidently from Barillon), Sunderland, after the Revolution, had the effrontery to deny. Reesby (July 13, p. 398) also mentions it. Lord Halifax (Devonshire House 'note book') has several anecdotes tending to show that Sunderland actually conformed, and that Father Petre had to say two masses a morning in order that Sunderland and Mulgrave might communicate without each other's knowledge.

<sup>3</sup> *History of England during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart*, p. 739.

<sup>4</sup> An interesting letter from Mr. Wilson to Lord Halifax, dated July 18 (Devonshire MSS.), mentions that at Retford Sessions the Duke of Newcastle, brother-in-law of the Marquis, and Sergeant Millington, a cousin, who was supposed to aim at a Judgeship, threatened the county with the King's anger for the bonfires in honour of the bishops' acquittal, and the corporation with a regulation unless it promised to vote for members opposed to the Test. The Duke (who had drunk the bishops' health not long before) observed: 'Testes were but of a late standing, contrived by Shaftesbury to ruin the King: possibly, s<sup>d</sup> he, you may put confidence in my L<sup>d</sup> Halifax, y<sup>t</sup> he will use his endeavour to continue them, but I assure you he will appear as indifferent a man for this as any man in England,' &c.

<sup>5</sup> The letter is in the collection known as 'King William's Chest' (Record Office), but is printed at length by Dalrymple, part i., book v., appendix, p. 107. The handwriting is said to be Sidney's.

by an armed descent, such assistance as Russel<sup>1</sup> and 1688 Zulestein declare him ready and willing to provide.

Lord Nottingham, head of the moderate High Churchmen, a man of ability and character, with whom Halifax had become politically intimate, had withdrawn from the conspiracy at the last moment on conscientious grounds—a rather perilous proceeding;<sup>2</sup> Lord Halifax, of course, was entirely ignorant of the affair,<sup>3</sup> and three weeks later we find him writing as follows to the Prince:—

*The Marquis of Halifax to the Prince of Orange.*<sup>4</sup>

So many things have happened of late, that it is reasonable enough to conclude, upon the first apprehension of them, that they should produce great alterations in reference to the publique, and yet with all this, upon a strict observation of all circumstances, I see nothing to raise more hopes on one side, or to incline the other to despayre. I find that every new attempt bringeth a fresh disadvantage upon the great designe, which is exposed and disappointed by so many repeated mistakes; The world is so much confirmed, that there is every day lesse danger of being overrunne; The severall parties, though differing never so much in other things, seem to agree in their resolution of preserving, by all legall means, the securities of their Religion and their Laws. The late businesse concerning the bishops hath had such an effect, that it is hardly to bee imagined; the consequences are not seen to their full extent by the men in power, though they are not a little mortified by the ill successe of it:<sup>5</sup> I look upon it as that which hath brought all the Protestants [together], and bound them up into a knot, that cannot easily be untied. It is one of those kind of faults that can never bee repayed: All that can bee done to mend it will probably make it worse, as is seen already by every step that hath been since made to recover the reputation they have lost by it. It is given out, that there will bee yet some further proceedings

<sup>1</sup> '35,' his cipher equivalent.

<sup>2</sup> Both Halifax (Devonshire House 'note book' and the Spencer House 'diary'), on the authority of William, and Dartmouth (note to Burnet), on the authority of Shrewsbury, say the conspirators discussed the advisability of pistolling him.

<sup>3</sup> Dalrymple states that William specially forbade his initiation. This is probably a mere inference. Von Ranke's statement that Halifax, like Nottingham, had only recoiled at the last moment, is certainly incorrect. The assertion in an anonymous letter of June 18, 1688 (Dalrymple, part i., book v., app. 106), '21' (Halifax) 'hath been backward in all this matter,' may refer either to the Prince's projects or the trial of the bishops.

<sup>4</sup> From King William's Chest. See also Dalrymple, part i., book v. app. 116.

<sup>5</sup> 'Il semble' (wrote Barillon) 'qu'il y ait eu comme une épreuve des forces des deux partis, et que celui du peuple ait été entièrement supérieur à celui de la Royauté' (Mazure, ii. 469).

1688 against the bishops; <sup>1</sup> but in that I am an unbeliever, as well as concerning the meeting of the p<sup>te</sup>; my opinion being still the same as I gave your H[ighne]sse in my last, the continuance of the discourse of it, and even by those who are presumed to know best, doth not at [all] make mee alter my judgement. A p[ar]l[iamen]t can never be an indifferent thing, and therefore it is a very weak argum<sup>en</sup>t to say that it will bee tried, and if it doth not comply, it shall bee dissolved. Things of this kind are not to bee so handled; the consequences may bee too great to make the experiment, without better grounds to expect success than at present appear. In short, I still remaine perswaded that there is no effectuall progresse made towards the great designe; and even the thing <sup>2</sup> that party relyeth upon, is subject to so many accidents and uncertainties, <sup>3</sup> that according to humane probability wee are secure, notwithstanding the ill appearances which fright most, when they are least examined. I wish your H[ighne]sse all happiness, and to myself the continuance of your good opinion, which cannot be more valued by any man living, than it is by your most devoted servant.

London, July 25, 88.

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER X

### *The Marquis of Halifax to Viscount Weymouth.*<sup>1</sup>

London Dec: 23. 86.

I am ready, my L<sup>d</sup> to give evidence that you are a punctuall man, and one who would give great encouragement to Usury if one was sure to meet with so great exactnesse; I send you here inclosed, a piece of paper to satisfie you, that your bond is cancelled. I shall give the bond, though it now signifieth nothing, to your brother, who will dispose it as you shall order.

I am,

my dear L<sup>ds</sup>

most faithfull

humble servant

HALIFAX.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Mazure, ii. 474, from Barillon, for these schemes; they were soon abandoned. The Ecclesiastical Commission on July 12 demanded returns of the manner in which the Declaration had been read from the diocesan officials, but their commands were generally neglected (Kennet, iii. 486).

<sup>2</sup> This probably refers to the birth of the Prince of Wales.

<sup>3</sup> The child had been thought to be dying, July 9 (Dalrymple, part i., book v., appendix, p. 176; see also Mazure, ii. 475, probably from Barillon; also *ibid.* iii. 9 (Barillon, June  $\frac{1}{2}$ ); *ibid.* 10 (August  $\frac{6}{11}$ ); also *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xiii., part 2, p. 159 (letter of August 7).

<sup>4</sup> *Longleat MSS.* Addressed: 'For the right hon<sup>ble</sup> the L<sup>d</sup> Vicount Weymouth at Longleat. To bee left at Frome Somersetshire.'

<sup>5</sup> Seal: arms, with coronet, motto, and supporters.





# A Classified Catalogue OF WORKS IN GENERAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY  
**LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.**

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

91 AND 93 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, AND 32 HORNBY ROAD, BOMBAY

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>BADMINTON LIBRARY (THE)</i> -	11	MENTAL, MORAL, AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY -	14
BIOGRAPHY, PERSONAL MEMOIRS, &c. -	7	MISCELLANEOUS AND CRITICAL WORKS -	31
CHILDREN'S BOOKS -	26	POETRY AND THE DRAMA -	20
CLASSICAL LITERATURE, TRANSLATIONS, ETC. -	19	POLITICAL ECONOMY AND ECONOMICS -	17
COOKERY, DOMESTIC MANAGEMENT, &c. -		POPULAR SCIENCE -	24
EVOLUTION, ANTHROPOLOGY, &c. -	18	RELIGION, THE SCIENCE OF -	18
FICTION, HUMOUR, &c. -	21	<i>SILVER LIBRARY (THE)</i> -	27
<i>FUR, FEATHER AND FIN SERIES</i>		SPORT AND PASTIME -	11
<i>FINF ARTS (THE) AND MUSIC</i> -		<i>STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES</i> -	16
HISTORY, POLITICS, POLITY, POLITICAL MEMOIRS, &c. -		TRAVEL AND ADVENTURE, THE COLONIES, &c. -	9
LANGUAGE, HISTORY, AND SCIENCE OF -		WORKS OF REFERENCE -	25
LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &c. -			

## INDEX OF AUTHORS AND EDITORS.

	Page		Page		Page
Abbott (Evelyn) -	3, 19	Baring Gould (Rev. S.) -	18, 27, 31	Cameron of Lochiel -	13
— (J. H. M.) -	3	Barnett (S. A. and H.) -	17	Campbell (Rev. Lewis) -	18, 19
— (T. K.) -	14, 15	Baynes (T. S.) -	31	Camperdown (Earl of) -	8
— (E. A.) -	15	Beaconsfield (Earl of) -	21	Cawthorne (Geo. Jas.) -	13
Acland (J. H. D.) -	3	Beaufort (Duke of) -	11, 12	Chesney (Sir G.) -	31
Acton (Edw.) -	20	Becker (W. A.) -	19	Childie-Pemberton (W. S.) -	8
Adeane (J. H.) -	8	Beesly (A. H.) -	8	Cholmondeley-Pennell (H.) -	11
Adelborg (O.) -	26	Bell (Mrs. Hugh) -	20	Christie (R. C.) -	11
Æschylus -	19	Bent (J. Theodore) -	9	Churchill (W. Spencer) -	3, 21
Ainger (A. C.) -	12	Besant (Sir Walter) -	3	Cicero -	19
Albemarle (Earl of) -	11	Bickerdyke (J.) -	11	Clarke (Rev. R. F.) -	16
Allen (Grant) -	25	Bird (G.) -	20	Clemenson (P. J.) -	9
Allogood (G.) -	20	Blackburne (J. H.) -	13	Clodd (Edward) -	18, 25
Angwin (M. C.) -	24	Bland (Mrs. Hubert) -	21	Clutterbuck (W. J.) -	10
Anstey (F.) -	11	Blount (Sir F.) -	7	Colenso (R. J.) -	30
Aristophanes -	20	Boase (Rev. C. W.) -	5	Conington (John) -	19
Aristotle -	14	Boedder (Rev. B.) -	16	Conway (Sir W. M.) -	11
Arnold (Sir Edwin) -	9, 20	Bowen (W. E.) -	7	Conybeare (Rev. W. J.) -	10
— (Dr. T.) -	3	Brassey (Lady) -	10	& Howson (Dean) -	27
Ashbourne (Lord) -	3	— (Lord) -	12	Coolidge (W. A. B.) -	26
Ashby (H.) -	20	Bray (C.) -	15	Corbin (M.) -	9
Ashley (W. J.) -	3, 17	Bright (Rev. J. F.) -	3	Corbett (Julian S.) -	3, 4
Avebury (Lord) -	18	Broadfoot (Major W.) -	11	Coutts (W.) -	19
Ayre (Rev. J.) -	25	Brown (A. F.) -	26	Coventry (A.) -	12
Bacon -	7, 14, 15	— (J. Moray) -	12	Cox (Harding) -	11
Bagehot (W.) -	7, 15, 27, 31	Bryce (J.) -	11	Crake (Rev. A. D.) -	26
Bagwell (R.) -	12	Bucke (H. A.) -	12	Crawford (J. H.) -	3
Bailey (H. C.) -	1	Buckland (Jas.) -	26	— (R.) -	10
Baillie (A. F.) -	1	Buckle (H. T.) -	3	Creed (S.) -	21
Bain (Alexander) -	0	Bull (T.) -	3	Creighton (Bishop) -	4, 5, 8
Baker (J. H.) -	1, 18	Burke (U. R.) -	3	Crozier (J. B.) -	8, 15
— (Sir S. W.) -	0	Burns (C. L.) -	30	Castance (Col. H.) -	13
Balfour (A. J.) -	6	Burrows (Montagu) -	9	Cutts (Rev. E. L.) -	5
— (Lady Betty) -	9	Butler (E. A.) -	24	Dabney (J. P.) -	20
Ball (John) -	9			Dale (T. F.) -	12
Banks (M. M.) -				Dallinger (F. W.) -	5
				Darlington (M. G.) -	8
				Davidson (W. L.) -	15, 17, 18
				Davies (J. F.) -	19
				Dent (C. T.) -	11
				De Salis (Mrs.) -	89
				De Tocqueville (A.) -	4
				Devas (C. S.) -	16, 17
				Dickinson (G. L.) -	
				— (W. H.) -	
				Dougall (L.) -	
				Powden (E.) -	32
				Doyle (A. Conan) -	21
				Du Bois (W. E. B.) -	5
				Dufferin (Marquis of) -	2
				Dunbar (Mary F.) -	
				Dyson (E.) -	
				Ehrington (Viscount) -	
				Ellis (I. H.) -	
				— (R. I.) -	14
				Erasmus -	8, 31
				Evans (Sir John) -	31
				Falkiner (C. I.) -	4
				Farar (Dean) -	17, 21
				Fitzgibbon (M.) -	4
				Fitzmaurice (Lord E.) -	
				Folkard (H. C.) -	
				Ford (H.) -	
				— (W. J.) -	
				Fountain (P.) -	
				Fowler (Edith H.) -	
				Francis (Francis) -	
				Francis (M. E.) -	
				Freeman (Edward A.) -	
				Fremantle (T. F.) -	
				Froehfield (E. W.) -	



# INDEX OF AUTHORS AND EDITORS—continued.

	Page		Page		Page		Page
Frost (G.)	31	Johnson (J. & J. H.)	31	Murray (Hilda)	26	Smith (W. P. Haskett)	10
Froude (James A.)	4, 8, 10, 22	ones (H. Bence)	25	Myers (F. W. H.)	26	Somerville (E.)	23
Fuller (F. W.)	24	oyce (P. W.)	5, 22, 31	Nansen (F.)	26	Sophocles	19
Furneaux (W.)	24	Justinian	15	Nash (V.)	26	Soulaby (Lucy H.)	32
Gardiner (Samuel R.)	4	Kant (I.)	15	Nesbitt (E.)	26	Southey (R.)	32
Gathorne-Har. Hon. A. E.)	13	Kaye (Sir J. W.)	15	Nettleship (R. L.)	15	Spahr (C. B.)	17
Geikie (Rev. Cunningham)	13	Keller (A. G.)	19	Newman (Cardinal)	23	Spedding (J.)	17
Gibson (C. H.)	13	Kelly (E.)	15	Nichols (F. M.)	8, 31	Spender (A. E.)	14
Gleig (Rev. G. R.)	14	Keir (C. B.)	15	Nichols (F. M.)	8, 31	Stanley (Bishop)	10
Goethe	20	Kerr (A. J.)	12	Ogilvie (R.)	19	Stebbing (W.)	2
Going (C. B.)	20	Killick (Rev. A. H.)	15	Oldfield (Hon. Mrs.)	19	Steel (A. G.)	9
Gore-Booth (Sir H. W.)	12	Kingsley (Rose G.)	30	Oliphant (N.)	12	Stephen (Leslie)	11
Graham (A.)	4	Kitchin (Dr. G. W.)	5	Onslow (Earl of)	6	Stephens (H. Morse)	10
— (P. A.)	13	Knight (E. F.)	10, 12	Osbourne (L.)	24	Sternberg (Count)	10
— (G. F.)	13	Kostlin (J.)	8	Packard (A. S.)	18	— (Adalbert)	—
Granby (Marquess of)	13	Kristeller (P.)	30	Paget (Sir J.)	9	Stevens (R. W.)	31
Grant (Sir A.)	14	Ladd (G. T.)	15	Park (W.)	14	Stevenson (R. L.)	21, 24, 26
Graves (R. P.)	8	Lang (Andrew)	5, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 31	Parker (B.)	32	Storr (F.)	—
Green (T. Hill)	15	Lapsley (G. T.)	5	Passmore (T. H.)	32	Stuart-Wortley (A. J.)	12, 17
Greene (E. B.)	5	Lascelles (Hon. G.)	11, 13	Payne-Gallwey (Sir R.)	12	Stubbs (J. W.)	—
Greville (C. C. F.)	4	Laurie (S. S.)	5	Pearson (C. H.)	12	Suffolk & Berkshire	—
Grose (T. H.)	15	Lawley (Hon. F.)	12	Peek (Hedley)	9	— (Earl of)	11, 12
Gross (C.)	4, 5	Lawrence (F. W.)	17	Pemberton (W. S.)	12	Sullivan (Sir E.)	12
Grove (F. C.)	11	Lear (H. L. Sidney)	20, 31	Childre	8	Sully (James)	16
— (Lady)	10	Lucks (W. E. H.)	5, 16, 20	Pembroke (Earl of)	12	Sutherland (A. and G.)	7
— (Mrs Lilly)	10	Lees (J. A.)	10	Pennant (C. D.)	11	— (Alex.)	16, 31
Gurdon (Lady Camilla)	22	Leighton (J. A.)	10	Pennrose (Mrs.)	26	Sutton (B. von)	12
Gurnhill (J.)	15	Leslie (T. E. Cliffe)	17	Phillips Wolley (C.)	11, 23	Swan (M.)	24
Gwilt (J.)	25	Lieven (Princess)	8	Pierce (A. H.)	10	Swinburne (A. J.)	16
Haggard (H. Rider)	10, 22	Lillie (A.)	14	Pitman (C. M.)	12	Symes (J. E.)	17
Hake (O.)	12	Lindsay (J.)	14	Pleydell-Bouverie (E. O.)	12	Tatt (J.)	—
Halliwel-Phillips (J.)	12	Loch (C. S.)	25	Pole (W.)	14	Tallentyre (S. G.)	9
Hamilton (Col H B)	5	Lacock (C. D.)	31	Pollock (W. H.)	11, 37	Tappan (B. M.)	20
Hamlin (A. D. F.)	30	Lodge (H. C.)	14	Poole (W. H. and Mrs)	32	Taylor (Col. Meadows)	—
Harding (S. B.)	5	Lofie (Rev. W. J.)	5	Poore (G. V.)	29	Tebbutt (C. G.)	12
Harmsworth (A. C.)	12	Longman (C. J.)	11, 13	Pope (W. H.)	13	Terry (C. S.)	8
Harte (Bret)	22	— (P. W.)	11, 13	Powell (H.)	7	Thomas (J. W.)	10
Harting (J. E.)	13	— (G. H.)	1	Powys (Mrs. P. L.)	7	Thomson (H. C.)	7
Hartwig (G.)	25	— (Mrs. C. J.)	30	Praeger (S. Rosamond)	26	Thornhill (W. J.)	10
Hassall (A.)	7	Lowell (A. I.)	30	Prevost (C.)	11	Thornton (T. H.)	9
Haweis (H. R.)	8, 30	Lubbock (Sir John)	18	Pritchett (R. T.)	12	Todd (A.)	7
Head (Mrs)	30	Lucan	19	Proctor (R. A.)	14, 25, 28, 29	Toni (T. L.)	—
Heath (J. D.)	12	Lutslawski (W.)	16	Raine (Rev. James)	3	Tosnee (A.)	17
Heathcote (J. M.)	12	Lyall (Edna)	23	Ramal (W.)	3	Trevelyan (Sir G. O.)	6, 7, 8
— (C. G.)	10	Lynch (G.)	6	Randolph (C. L.)	7	— (G. M.)	7
— (N.)	10	— (H. T. B.)	6	Rankin (R.)	7, 21	Trollope (Anthony)	21
Helmholtz (Hermann von)	2	Lytelton (Hon. R. H.)	11	Ransome (Cyril)	3, 7	Turner (H. G.)	32
Henderson (Lieut. Col. G. F. R.)	8	— (Hon. A.)	12	Raymond (W.)	23	Tyndall (J.)	8, 10
Henry (W.)	12	Lytton (Earl of)	6, 20	Reid (S. J.)	23	Tyrrill (R. Y.)	19
Henty (G. A.)	26	Macaulay (Lord)	6, 8, 20	Rhoades (J.)	19	Unwin (R.)	—
Herbert (Col. Kenney)	13	Macdonald (Dr. G.)	8, 20	Rice (S. J.)	19	Upton (F. K. and Bertha)	2
Herod (Richard S.)	13	Macfarren (Sir G. A.)	30	Rich (A.)	19	Von Dyke (J. C.)	30
Hiley (R. W.)	8	MacKail (J. W.)	9, 19	Richardson (C.)	11, 13	Virgil	10
Hill (Mabel)	5	MacKenzie (C. G.)	16	Richmond (Linn)	10	Wagner (R.)	21
Killer (G. Lacy)	17	Mackinnon (J.)	4	Rickaby (Rev. John)	6	Wakeman (H. O.)	2
Hime (H. W. L.)	16	MacLeod (H. D.)	17	Ridley (Sir E.)	6	Walford (L. B.)	24
Hodgeson (Shadworth)	15, 21	Matherson (Rev. H. A.)	12, 13	— (Lady Alice)	21	Wallas (Graham)	9
Hoeig (F.)	11	Madden (D. H.)	12, 13	Riley (J. W.)	21	— (Mrs. Graham)	—
Hogan (J. F.)	9	Magnusson (E.)	14	Roberts (E. P.)	20	Walpole (Sir Spencer)	10
Holmes (R. R.)	9	Maher (Rev. M.)	16	Rogers (P. M.)	17, 25	— (Horace)	—
Holroyd (M. J.)	8	Mallison (Col. G. B.)	5	Romanes (G. J.)	9, 10, 18, 21	Walrod (Col. H.)	11
Homer	19	Marbriant (A. W.)	2	— (Mrs. G. J.)	10	Walsingham (Lord)	1
Hope (Anthony)	22	Marshman (J. C.)	8	Ronalds (A.)	4	Ward (Mrs. W.)	2
Horace	19	Marson (M.)	32	Roosevelt (T.)	5	Warwick (Countess of)	2
Houston (D. F.)	22	Mason (A. F. W.)	23	Ross (Martin)	23	Watson (A. B. T.)	11, 12
Howard (Lady Mabel)	22	Maskelyne (J. N.)	14	Kossetti (Maria Francesca)	12	Weathers (J.)	10
Howitt (W.)	10	Matthews (B.)	25	Kotheram (M. A.)	29	Webb (Mr. and Mrs. Sidney)	17
Hudson (W. H.)	25	Mauder (S.)	32	Kowe (R. P. F.)	29	— (T. E.)	16, 30
Huish (M. B.)	30	Max Muller (F.)	9, 16, 17, 18, 23, 32	Russell (Lady)	12	Weber (A.)	10
Hullah (J.)	30	May (Sir T. Erskine)	6	Saintsbury (G.)	9	Weir (Capt. R.)	12
Hume (David)	15	Meade (L. T.)	26	Sanders (T. C.)	15	Wellington (Duchess of)	1
— (M. A. S.)	3	Melville (G. J. Whyte)	23	Sanders (L. K.)	15	West (B. B.)	1
Hunt (Rev. W.)	5	Mervale (Dean)	6	Savage-Armstrong (G. F.)	21	Weyman (Stanley)	21
Hunter (Sir W.)	5	Merriman (H. S.)	23	Seeborn (F.)	7, 9	Whately (Archbishop)	11, 16
Hutchinson (Horace G.)	11, 13, 31	Mill (John Stuart)	16, 17	Selous (F. C.)	11, 14	Whitlaw (R.)	10
Ingelow (Jean)	20	Millias (J. G.)	14	Senior (W.)	12, 13	Whittall (Sir J. W.)	1
Ingram (T. D.)	5	Miller (G.)	32	Sewell (Elizabeth M.)	2	Wilkins (G.)	11
Jackson (A. W.)	15	Monck (W. H. S.)	16	Shakespeare	2	— (W. H.)	—
James (W.)	15	Montague (F. C.)	6	Shand (A. I.)	1	Willard (A. R.)	30
Jameson (Mrs. Anna)	31	Moon (G. W.)	20	Shaw (W. A.)	7, 3	Willich (C. M.)	25
Jeffries (Richard)	31	Moore (T.)	25	Shearman (P.)	23	Witham (T. M.)	12
Jekyll (Gertrude)	31	— (Rev. Edward)	17	Sheehan (M. A.)	23	Wood (Rev. J. G.)	25
Jerome (Jerome K.)	22	Morgan (C. Lloyd)	14	Sinclair (A.)	12	Wood-Martin (W. G.)	—
		Morris (Mowbray)	11	Skrine (F. H.)	8	Wyatt (A. J.)	—
		— (W.)	19, 20, 23, 30, 32	Smith (C. Fell)	9	Wylie (J. H.)	—
		Mulhall (M. G.)	17	— (R. Bosworth)	7	Yeats (S. Levett)	—
				— (T. C.)	7	Zeller (E.)	—

# History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.

**Abbott.**—*A HISTORY OF GREECE.* By EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D.

Part I.—From the Earliest Times to the Ionian Revolt. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Part II.—500-445 B.C. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Part III.—From the Peace of 445 B.C. to the Fall of the Thirty at Athens in 403 B.C. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Abbott.**—*TOMMY CORNSTALK*: being Some Account of the Less Notable Features of the South African War from the Point of View of the Australian Ranks. By J. H. M. ABBOTT, late Corporal, First Australian Horse.

**Acland and Ransome.**—*A HANDBOOK IN OUTLINE OF THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND TO 1896.* Chronologically Arranged. By the Right Hon. A. H. DYKE ACLAND, and CYRIL RANSOME, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Allgood.**—*CHINA WAR, 1860: LETTERS AND JOURNALS.* By Major-General G. ALLGOOD, C.B., formerly Lieut. G. ALLGOOD, 1st Division China Field Force. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Demy 4to. 12s. 6d. net.

**Annual Register (The).** A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad, for the year 1900. 8vo., 18s.

Volumes of the *ANNUAL REGISTER* for the years 1863-1899 can still be had. 18s. each.

**Arnold.**—*INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., formerly Head Master of Rugby School. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Ashbourne.**—*PITT: SOME CHAPTERS ON HIS LIFE AND TIMES.* By the Right Hon. EDWARD GIBSON, LORD ASHBOURNE, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. With 11 Portraits. 8vo., gilt top, 21s.

**Ashley.**—*SURVEYS, HISTORIC AND ECONOMIC*: a Volume of Essays. By W. J. ASHLEY, M.A. 8vo., 9s. net.

**Bagwell.**—*IRELAND UNDER THE TUDORS.* By RICHARD BAGWELL, LL.D. (3 vols.) Vols. I. and II. From the first invasion of the Northmen to the year 1578. 8vo., 32s. Vol. III. 1578-1603. 8vo., 18s.

**Baillie.**—*THE ORIENTAL CLUB, AND HANOVER SQUARE.* By ALEXANDER F. BAILLIE. With 6 Photogravure Portraits and 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 4to., 25s. net.

**Besant.**—*THE HISTORY OF LONDON.* By Sir WALTER BESANT. With 74 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 1s. 9d. Or bound as a School Prize Book, gilt edges, 2s. 6d.

**Bright.**—*A HISTORY OF ENGLAND.* By the Rev. J. FRANK BRIGHT, D.D.

Period I. *MEDÆVAL MONARCHY*: A.D. 449-1485. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Period II. *PERSONAL MONARCHY*. 1485-1688. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Period III. *CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY*. 1689-1837. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Period IV. *THE GROWTH OF DEMOCRACY*. 1837-1880. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Bruce.**—*THE FORWARD POLICY AND ITS RESULTS*; or, Thirty-five Years' Work amongst the Tribes on our North-Western Frontier of India. By RICHARD ISAAC BRUCE, C.I.E. With 28 Illustrations and a Map. 8vo., 15s. net.

**Buckle.**—*HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND, FRANCE, SPAIN, AND SCOTLAND.* By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 24s.

**Burke.**—*A HISTORY OF SPAIN, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE DEATH OF FERDINAND THE CATHOLIC.* By ULICK RALPH BURKE, M.A. Edited by MARTIN A. S. HUME. With 6 Maps. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16s. net.

**Caroline, Queen.**—*CAROLINE THE ILLUSTRIOUS, QUEEN-CONSORT OF GEORGE II. AND SOMETIME QUEEN REGENT*: a Study of Her Life and Time. By W. H. WILKINS, M.A., F.S.A. Author of 'The Love of an Uncrowned Queen'. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.

**Chesney.**—*INDIAN POLITY*: a View of the System of Administration in India. By General Sir GEORGE CHESNEY, K.C.B. With Map showing all the Administrative Divisions of British India. 8vo., 21s.

**Churchill (WINSTON SPENCER, M.P.).** *THE RIVER WAR*: an Historical

Account of the Reconquest of the Soudan. Edited by Colonel F. RHODES, D.S.O. With 34 Maps and Plans, and 51 Illustrations from Drawings by ANGUS McNEILL. Also with 7 Photogravure Portraits of Generals, etc. 2 vols. Medium 8vo., 36s.

*THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE, 1897.* With 6 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*LONDON TO LADY'S MITHVIAPRETORIA.* Crown 8vo., 6s.

*IAN HAMILTON'S MARCH.* With Portrait of Lieut.-General Ian Hamilton, and 10 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Corbett (JULIAN S.).**

*DRAKE AND THE TUDOR NAVY*, with a History of the Rise of England as a Maritime Power. With Portraits, Illustrations and Maps. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16s.

# History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—continued.

**Corbett (JULIAN S.)—continued.**

*THE SUCCESSORS OF DRAKE.* With 4 Portraits (2 Photogravures) and 12 Maps and Plans. 8vo., 21s.

**Creighton (M., D.D., Late Lord Bishop of London).**

*A HISTORY OF THE PAPACY FROM THE GREAT SCHISM TO THE SACK OF ROME, 1378-1527.* 6 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5s. net each.

*QUEEN ELIZABETH.* With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*HISTORICAL ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.* Edited by LOUISE CREIGHTON.

**De Tocqueville.—DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA.** By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by HENRY REEVE, C.B., D.C.L. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16s.

**Dickinson.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARLIAMENT DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** By G. LOWES DICKINSON, M.A. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Falkiner.—STUDIES IN IRISH HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.** Mainly of the Eighteenth Century. By C. LILTON FALKINER. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.

**Fitzgibbon.—ARIS UNDER ARMS: an University Man in Khaki.** By MAURICE FITZGIBBON, B.A., Trinity College, Dublin University, late Trooper and Sergeant-Major, 45th Company (Irish Hunt Contingent) Imperial Yeomanry. With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 5s. net.

**Fitzmaurice.—CHARLES WILLIAM FERDINAND, DUKE OF BRUNSWICK: an Historical Study.** By LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE. With Map and 2 Portraits. 8vo., 6s. net.

**Froude (JAMES A.).**

*THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.* 12 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

*THE DIVORCE OF CATHERINE OF ARAGON.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE SPANISH STORY OF THE ARMADA, and other Essays.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.* 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

*ENGLISH SEAMEN IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.*

*Cabinet Edition.* Crown 8vo., 6s.

*Illustrated Edition.* With 5 Photogravure Plates and 16 other Illustrations. Large Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 6s. net.

*'Silver Library' Edition.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Froude (JAMES A.)—continued.**

*THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS.* 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

*CÆSAR: a Sketch.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE.* Edited by P. S. ALLEN, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Fuller.—EGYPT AND THE HINTERLAND.** By FREDERIC W. FULLER. With Frontispiece and Map of Egypt and the Sudan. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

**Gardiner (SAMUEL RAWSON, D.C.L., LL.D.).**

*HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642.* 10 vols. Crown 8vo., 5s. net each.

*A HISTORY OF THE GREAT CIVIL WAR, 1642-1649.* 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5s. net each.

*A HISTORY OF THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE PROTECTORATE, 1649-1660.* Vol. I. 1649-1651. With 14 Maps. 8vo., 21s. Vol. II. 1651-1654. With 7 Maps. 8vo., 21s. Vol. III. 1654-1656. With 6 Maps. 8vo., 21s.

*THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.* With 378 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 12s.

*Also in Three Volumes, price 4s. each.*

*WILLIAM GUNPOWDER PLOT WAS.* With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*CROMWELL'S PLACE IN HISTORY.* Founded on Six Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*OLIVER CROMWELL.* With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

**Graham.—ROMAN AFRICA.** an Outline of the History of the Roman Occupation of North Africa, based chiefly upon Inscriptions and Monumental Remains in that Country. By ALEXANDER GRAHAM, F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A. With 30 reproductions of Original Drawings by the Author, and 2 Maps. 8vo., 16s. net.

**Greville.—A JOURNAL OF THE REIGN OF KING GEORGE IV., KING WILLIAM IV., AND QUEEN VICTORIA.** By CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, formerly Clerk of the Council. 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

**Gross.—THE SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF ENGLISH HISTORY, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO ABOUT 1485.** By CHARLES GROSS, Ph.D. 8vo., 18s. net.

# History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—continued.

**Hamilton.**—*HISTORICAL RECORD OF THE 14TH (KING'S) HUSSARS*, from A.D. 1715 to A.D. 1900. By Colonel HENRY BLACKBURN HAMILTON, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford; late Commanding the Regiment. With 15 Coloured Plates, 35 Portraits, etc., in Photogravure, and 10 Maps and Plans. Crown 4to., gilt edges, 42s. net.

## HARVARD HISTORICAL STUDIES.

*THE SUPPRESSION OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 1638-1870.* By W. E. B. DUBOIS, Ph.D. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

*THE CONTEST OVER THE RATIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.* By S. B. HARDING, A.M. 8vo., 6s.

*A CRITICAL STUDY OF NULLIFICATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA.* By D. F. HOUSTON, A.M. 8vo., 6s.

*NOMINATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES.* By FREDERICK W. DALLINGER, A.M. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

*A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BRITISH MUNICIPAL HISTORY, INCLUDING GUILD AND PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION.* By CHARLES GROSS, Ph.D. 8vo., 12s.

*THE LIBERTY AND FREE SOIL PARTIES IN THE NORTH WEST.* By THOMAS C. SMITH, Ph.D. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

*THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNOR IN THE ENGLISH COLONIES OF NORTH AMERICA.* By EVARTS BOUTWELL GREENE, 8vo., 7s. 6d.

*THE COUNTY PALATINE OF DURHAM, a Study in Constitutional History.* By GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY, Ph.D. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Hill.** *LIBERTY DO* With Contemporary Exposition and Critical Comments drawn from various Writers. Selected and Prepared by MABEL HILL. Edited with an Introduction by ALBERT BUSENELL HART, Ph.D. Large Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Historic Towns.**—Edited by E. A. FRIEMAN, D.C.L., and Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. With Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

Bristol. By Rev W. Hunt.	Oxford. By Rev. C. W.
Carlisle. By Mandell	Boase
Creighton, D.D.	Winchester. By G. W.
Cinque Ports. By Mon-	Kitchin, D.D.
tagu Burrows.	York. By Rev James
Colchester. By Rev E. L.	Raine.
Cutts	New York. By Theodore
Exeter. By E. A. Freeman.	Roosevelt.
London. By Rev. W. J.	Boston (U.S.). By Henry
Lofie	Cabot Lodge

**Hunter.**—*A HISTORY OF BRITISH INDIA.* By Sir WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D. Vol. I.—Introductory to the Overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago, 1623. With 4 Maps. 8vo., 18s. Vol. II.—To the Union of the Old and New Companies under the Earl of Godolphin & Awar, 1708. 8vo., 16s.

**Ingram.**—*A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF IRISH HISTORY.* From the Elizabethan Conquest to the Legislative Union of 1800. By T. DUNBAR INGRAM, LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo., 24s.

**Joyce.**—*A SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND*, from the Earliest Times to 1603. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Kaye and Malleon.**—*HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY, 1857-1858.* By Sir JOHN W. KAYE and Colonel G. B. MALLESON. With Analytical Index and Maps and Plans. 6 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

**Kent.**—*THE ENGLISH RADICALS: an Historical Sketch.* By C. B. ROYLANCE KENT. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Lang.**—*THE MYSTERY OF MARY SACRI.* By ANDREW LANG. With 6 Photogravure Plates (4 Portraits) and 15 other Illustrations. 8vo., 18s. net.

**Laurie.**—*HISTORICAL SURVEY OF PRE-CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.* By S. S. LAURIE, A.M., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Lecky (The Rt. Hon. WILLIAM E. H.)** *HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.*

*Library Edition.* 8 vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., 1700-1760, 36s.; Vols. III. and IV., 1760-1784, 36s.; Vols. V. and VI., 1784-1793, 36s.; Vols. VII. and VIII., 1793-1800, 36s.

*Cabinet Edition.* ENGLAND. 7 vols. Crown 8vo., 5s. net each. IRELAND. 5 vols. Crown 8vo., 5s. net each.

*HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS FROM AUGUSTUS TO CHARLEMAGNE.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10s. net.

*HISTORY OF THE RISE AND INFLUENCE OF THE SPIRIT OF RATIONALISM IN EUROPE.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10s. net.

*DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY.* *Library Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.

*Cabinet Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 10s. net.

**Lowell.**—*GOVERNMENTS AND PARTIES IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE.* By A. LAWRENCE LOWELL. 2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

# History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—continued.

**Lynch.**—*THE WAR OF THE CIVILISATIONS: BEING A RECORD OF A FOREIGN DEVIL'S EXPERIENCES WITH THE ALLIES IN CHINA.* By GEORGE LYNCH. With Portrait and 21 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

**Lytton.**—*THE HISTORY OF LORD LYTTON'S INDIAN ADMINISTRATION, FROM 1876-1880.* Compiled from Letters and Official Papers. Edited by Lady BETTY BALFOUR. With Portrait and Map. 8vo., 18s.

**Macaulay (LORD).**

*THE LIFE AND WORKS OF LORD MACAULAY.*

'Edinburgh' Edition. 10 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.

Vols. I.-IV. *HISTORY OF ENGLAND.*

Vols. V.-VII. *ESSAYS, BIOGRAPHIES,*

*INDIAN PENAL CODE, CONTRIBUTIONS*

*TO KNIGHT'S 'QUARTERLY MAGAZINE',*

*VERGES, LAYS OF ANCIENT*

*ROME, MISCELLANEOUS POEMS.*

Vols. IX. and X. *THE LIFE AND*

*LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY.* By

Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart.

*THE WORKS.*

'Albany' Edition. With 12 Portraits.

12 vols. Large Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d. each.

Vols. I.-VI. *HISTORY OF ENGLAND,*

*FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE*

*SECOND.*

Vols. VII.-X. *ESSAYS AND BIOGRAPHIES.*

Vols. XI.-XII. *SPEECHES, LAYS OF*

*ANCIENT ROME, ETC., AND INDEX.*

Cabinet Edition. 16 vols. Post 8vo.,

£4 16s.

*HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE*

*ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND.*

Popular Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

'Student's Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 12s.

People's Edition. 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 16s.

'Albany' Edition. With 6 Portraits. 6

vols. Large Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

Cabinet Edition. 8 vols. Post 8vo., 48s.

'Edinburgh' Edition. 4 vols. 8vo., 6s.

each.

*CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS,*

*WITH LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, etc., in 1*

*volume.*

Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Authorised Edition. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

'Silver Library' Edition. With Portrait

and 4 Illustrations to the 'Lays'. Cr.

8vo., 3s. 6d.

Student's Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

People's Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 8s.

'Trevelyan' Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 9s.

Cabinet Edition. 4 vols. Post 8vo., 24s.

'Edinburgh' Edition. 3 vols. 8vo., 6s.

each.

**Macaulay (LORD)—continued.**

*ESSAYS*, which may be had separately,  
sewed, 6d. each; cloth, 1s. each.

Addison and Walpole.

Croker's Boswell's Johnson.

Hallam's Constitutional

History.

Warren Hastings.

The Earl of Chatham (Two

Essays).

Frederick the Great.

Ranke and Gladstone.

Lord Bacon.

Lord Clive.

Lord Byron, and The

Comic Dramatists of

the Restoration.

*MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS.*

People's Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

*MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS,*

*SPEECHES AND POEMS.*

Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Cabinet Edition. 4 vols. Post 8vo., 24s.

*SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF*

*LORD MACAULAY.* Edited, with Occa-

sional Notes, by the Right Hon. Sir G. O.

TREVELYAN, Bart. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Mackinnon.**—*THE HISTORY OF*

*EDWARD THE THIRD.* By JAMES MAC-

KINNON, Ph.D. 8vo., 18s.

**May.**—*THE CONSTITUTIONAL HIS-*

*TORY OF ENGLAND* since the Accession

of George III. 1760-1870. By Sir THOMAS

ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B. (Lord Farnborough).

3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 18s.

**Merivale (CHARLES, D.D.).**

*HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE*

*EMPIRE.* 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

*THE FALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC:*

A Short History of the Last Century of the

Commonwealth. 12mo., 7s. 6d.

*GENERAL HISTORY OF ROME,* from

the Foundation of the City to the Fall of

Augustulus, B.C. 753-A.D. 476. With 5

Maps. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**Montague.**—*THE ELEMENTS OF*

*ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.* By

F. C. MONTAGUE, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Nash.**—*THE GREAT FAMINE AND*

*ITS CAUSES.* By VAUGHAN NASH. With

8 Illustrations from Photographs by the

Author, and a Map of India showing the

Famine Area. 8vo., 6s.

**Olipphant.**—*A DIARY OF THE SIEGE*

*OF THE LEGATIONS IN PEKING DURING*

*THE SUMMER OF 1900.* By NIGEL OLI-

PHANT. With a Preface by ANDREW LANG,

and a Map and Plans. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

**Owens College Essays.**—Edited

by T. F. TOUT, M.A., Professor of History

in the Owens College, Victoria University,

and JAMES TAIT, M.A., Assistant Lecturer

in History. With 4 Maps. 8vo.

# History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—continued.

- Powell and Trevelyan.**—*THE PEASANTS' RISING AND THE LOLLARDS*: a Collection of Unpublished Documents, forming an Appendix to 'England in the Age of Wycliffe'. Edited by EDGAR POWELL and G. M. TREVELYAN. 8vo., 6s. net.
- Randolph.**—*THE LAW AND POLICY OF ANNEXATION*, with Special Reference to the Philippines; together with Observations on the Status of Cuba. By CARMAN F. RANDOLPH. 8vo., 9s. net.
- Rankin (Reginald).**  
*THE MARQUIS D'ARLONSON; AND RICHARD THE SECOND.* Two Critical Essays. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.  
*A SECRETARY'S LETTERS TO HIS WIFE.* (The Boer War.) Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.
- Ransome.**—*THE RISE OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND.* By CYRIL RANSOME, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Seeböhm (FREDERIC, LL.D., F.S.A.).**  
*THE ENGLISH VILLAGE COMMUNITY.* With 13 Maps and Plates. 8vo., 16s.  
*TRIBAL CUSTOM IN AFRICA AND ASIA.* Part I., being an Essay supplemental to (1) 'The English Village Community,' (2) 'The Tribal System in Wales'. 8vo., 16s.
- Shaw.**—*A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH DURING THE CIVIL WARS AND UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH, 1640-1660.* By WILLIAM A. SHAW, LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.
- Smith.**—*CARTHAGE AND THE CARTHAGINIANS.* By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A., With Maps, Plans, etc. Cl. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Stephens.**—*A HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.* By H. MORSE STEPHENS. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 18s. each.
- Sternberg.**—*MY EXPERIENCES OF THE BOER WAR.* By ALBERT COUNT STERNBERG. With Preface by Lieut.-Col. G. F. R. HENDERSON. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.
- Stubbs.**—*HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN*, from its Foundation to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By J. W. STUBBS. 8vo., 12s. 6d.
- Sutherland.**—*THE HISTORY OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND*, from 1606-1900. By ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND, M.A., and GEORGE SUTHERLAND, M.A. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.
- Taylor.**—*A STUDENT'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF INDIA.* By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR, C.S.I., etc. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Thomson.**—*CHINA AND THE POWERS*: a Narrative of the Outbreak of 1900. By H. C. THOMSON. With 2 Maps and 29 Illustrations. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.
- Todd.**—*PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.* By ALPHEUS TODD, LL.D. 8vo., 30s. net.
- Trevelyan.** *THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.* Part I. 1766-1776. By the Rt. Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart. 8vo., 16s.
- Trevelyan.**—*ENGLAND IN THE AGE OF WYCLIFFE.* By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. 8vo., 15s.
- Wakeman and Hassall.**—*ESSAYS INTRODUCTORY TO THE STUDY OF ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.* Edited by HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A., and ARTHUR HASSALL, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Walpole.**—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE CONCLUSION OF THE GREAT WAR IN 1815 TO 1858.* By Sir SPENCER WALPOLE, K.C.B. 6 vols. Cr. 8vo., 6s. each.
- Wylie (JAMES HAMILTON, M.A.).**  
*HISTORY OF ENGLAND UNDER HENRY IV.* 4 vols. Crown 8vo. • Vol. I., 1399-1404, 10s. 6d. Vol. II., 1405-1406, 15s. (out of print). Vol. III., 1407-1411, 15s. Vol. IV., 1411-1413, 21s.
- THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE TO THE DEATH OF JOHN HUS:* Being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Lent Term, 1900. Cl. 8vo., 6s. net.

## Biography, Personal Memoirs, &c.

- Bacon.**—*THE LETTERS AND LIFE OF FRANCIS BACON, INCLUDING ALL HIS OCCASIONAL WORKS.* Edited by JAMES SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo., £4 4s.
- Bagehot.**—*BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Blount.**—*THE RECOLLECTIONS OF SIR EDWARD BLOUNT, 1815-1901.* Jotted down and arranged by STUART J. REID. With Portraits. 8vo.
- Bowen.**—*EDWARD E. BOWEN: a Memoir.* By the Rev. the Hon. W. E. BOWEN.

## Biography, Personal Memoirs, &c.—continued.

- Carlyle.**—*THOMAS CARLYLE: A History of his Life.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. 1795-1835. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s. 1834-1881. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s.
- Crozier.**—*MY INNER LIFE: being a Chapter in Personal Evolution and Autobiography.* By JOHN BEATTIE CROZIER, LL.D. 8vo., 14s.
- Dante.**—*THE LIFE AND WORKS OF DANTE ALIGHIERI: being an Introduction to the Study of the 'Divina Commedia'.* By the Rev. J. F. HOGAN, D.D. With Portrait. 8vo., 12s. 6d.
- Danton.**—*LIFE OF DANTON.* By A. H. BEESLY. With Portraits. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
- De Bode.**—*THE BIKONESS DE BODE, 1775-1803.* By WILLIAM S. CHILDE-PIMBERTON. With 4 Photogravure Portraits and other Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 12s. 6d. net.
- Duncan.**—*ADMIRAL DUNCAN.* By THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN. With 3 Portraits. 8vo., 16s.
- Erasmus.**  
*LIFE AND LETTERS OF ERASMUS.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*THE EPISTLES OF ERASMUS,* from his Earliest Letters to his Fifty first Year, arranged in Order of Time. English Translations with a Commentary. By FRANCIS MORGAN NICHOLS. 8vo., 18s. net.
- Faraday.**—*FARADAY AS A DISCOVERER.* By JOHN TYNDALE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Fénelon:** his Friends and his Epistles, 1651-1715. By F. K. SANDFERS. With Portrait. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
- Foreign Courts and Foreign Homes.** By A. M. F. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Fox.**—*THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart. Library Edition. 8vo., 18s. Cheap Edition. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Granville.**—*SOME RECORDS OF THE LATER LIFE OF HARRIET COUNTESS GRANVILLE.* By her Granddaughter, the Hon. Mrs. OLDFIELD. With 17 Portraits. 8vo., gilt top, 16s. net.
- Grey.**—*MEMOIR OF SIR GEORGE GRAY, BART, G.C.B., 1799-1882.* By MANFRED CREIGHTON, D.D., late Lord Bishop of London. With 3 Portraits. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.
- Hamilton.**—*LIFE OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON.* By R. P. GRAVES. 8vo., 3 vols. 15s. each. ADDENDUM. 8vo., 6d. sewed.
- Harrow School Register (The), 1801-1900.** Second Edition, 1901. Edited by M. G. DAUGLISH, Barrister at-Law. 8vo., 15s. net.
- Havelock.**—*MEMOIRS OF SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, K.C.B.* By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Haweis.**—*MY MUSICAL LIFE.* By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS. With Portrait of Richard Wagner and 3 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s. net.
- Hiley.**—*MEMOIRS OF HALF A CENTURY.* By the Rev. R. W. HILEY, D.D. With Portrait. 8vo., 15s.
- Holroyd (MARIA JOSEPHA).**  
*THE GIRLHOOD OF MARIA JOSEPHA HOLROYD (Lady Stanley of Alderley).* Recorded in Letters of a Hundred Years Ago, from 1776-1796. Edited by J. H. ADAMS. With 6 Portraits. 8vo., 18s.  
*THE EARLY MARRIED LIFE OF MARIA JOSEPHA, LADY STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, FROM 1796.* Edited by J. H. ADAMS. 10 Portraits, etc. 8vo., 18s.
- Hunter.**—*THE LIFE OF SIR WILLIAM HUNTER, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D.* Author of 'A History of British India,' etc. By FRANCIS HENRY SKENE, F.R.S. With 6 Portraits (2 Photogravures) and 4 other Illustrations. 8vo., 16s. net.
- Jackson.**—*STONEWALL JACKSON AND THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.* By Lieut.-Col. G. F. R. HENDERSON. With 2 Portraits and 34 Maps and Plans. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 16s. net.
- Leslie.**—*THE LIFE AND CAMPAIGNS OF ALEXANDER LESLIE, FIRST EARL OF LEVEN.* By CHARLES SANFORD TERRY, M.A. With Maps and Plans. 8vo., 16s.
- Lieven.**—*LETTERS OF THE PRINCESS LIEVEN DURING HER RESIDENCE IN LONDON, 1812-1834.* Edited by LIONEL ROBESON. With 2 Photogravure Portraits.
- Luther.**—*LIFE OF LUTHER.* By JULIUS KOSTLIN. With 62 Illustrations and 4 Facsimiles of MSS. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Macaulay.**—*THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart. Popular Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d. Student's Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 6s. Cabinet Edition. 2 vols. Post 8vo., 12s. 'Edinburgh' Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 6s. each. Library Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.

Biography, Personal Memoirs, etc.—*continued.*

- Martineau.**—*JAMES MARTINEAU.* A Biography and Study. By A. W. JACKSON, A.M., of Concord, Massachusetts. With 2 Portraits. 8vo., 12s. 6d.
- Max Müller (F.)**  
*MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY*: a Fragment. With 6 Portraits. 8vo., 12s. 6d.  
*AULD LANG SYNE.* Second Series. 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP.* Vol. II. Biographical Essays. Cr. 8vo., 5s.
- Meade.**—*GENERAL SIR RICHARD MEADE AND THE FEUDATORY STATES OF CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN INDIA.* By THOMAS HENRY THORNTON. With Portrait, Map and Illustrations. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.
- Morris.**—*THE LIFE OF WILLIAM MORRIS.* By J. W. MACKAIL. With 2 Portraits and 8 other Illustrations by E. H. NEW, etc. 2 vols. Large Crown 8vo., 10s. net.
- On the Banks of the Seine.** By A. M. F., Authoress of 'Foreign Courts and Foreign Homes'. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Paget.**—*MEMOIRS AND LETTERS OF SIR JAMES PAGET.* Edited by SUTHERLAND PAGET, one of his sons. With 6 Portraits (3 Photogravures) and 4 other Illustrations. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.
- Pearson.**—*CHARLES HENRY PEARSON,* Author of 'National Life and Character'. Memorials by Himself, his Wife, and his Friends. Edited by WILLIAM STERRING. With a Portrait. 8vo., 14s.
- Place.**—*THE LIFE OF FRANCIS PLACE,* 1771-1854. By GRAHAM WALLAS, M.A. With 2 Portraits. 8vo., 12s.
- Powys.**—*PASSAGES FROM THE DIARIES OF MRS. PHILIP LYRRE POWYS, OF HARTWICK HOUSE, OXON. 1756-1808.* Edited by EMILY J. CLIMENSON. 8vo., gilt top, 16s.
- Rāmakrishna:** *HIS LIFE AND SAYINGS.* By the Right Hon. F. MAX MÜLLER. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- Rich.**—*MARY RICH, COUNTESS OF WARRICK (1625-1678).* Her Family and Friends. By CHARLOTTE FELL SMITH. With 7 Photogravure Portraits and 9 other Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 18s. net.
- Romanes.**—*THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A., LL.D. F.R.S.* Written and Edited by his WIFE. With Portrait and 2 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5s. net.
- Russell.**—*SWALLOWFIELD AND ITS OWNERS.* By CONSTANCE LADY RUSSELL, of Swallowfield Park. With 15 Photogravure Portraits and 36 other Illustrations. 4to., gilt edges, 42s. net.
- Seebohm.**—*THE OXFORD REFORMERS—JOHN COLET, ERASMUS, AND THOMAS MORE:* a History of their Fellow-Work. By FREDERIC SEEBOHM. 8vo., 14s.
- Shakespeare.**—*OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE.* By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS. With Illustrations and Fac-similes. 2 vols. Royal 8vo., 21s.
- Tales of my Father.**—By A. M. F., Author of 'Foreign Courts and Foreign Homes,' and 'On the Banks of the Seine'. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Tallentyre.**—*THE WOMEN OF THE SILONS,* and other French Portraits. By S. G. TALLENTYRE. With 11 Photogravure Portraits. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.
- Victoria, Queen,** 1819-1901. By RICHARD R. HOLMES, M.V.O., F.S.A., Librarian to the Queen. With Photogravure Portrait. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 5s. net.
- Walpole.**—*SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF HORACE WALPOLE.* Edited by SIR SPENCER WALPOLE, K.C.B. With 2 Portraits. Crown 8vo.
- Wellington.**—*LIFE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.* By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Travel and Adventure, the Colonies, &c.

- Arnold.**—*SEAS AND LANDS.* By SIR EDWIN ARNOLD. With 71 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Baker (Sir S.W.).**  
*EIGHT YEARS IN CEYLON.* With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*THE RIFLE AND THE HOUND IN CEYLON.* With 6 Illusts. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Bent.**—*THE RUINED CITIES OF MASHONALAND:* being a Record of Excavation and Exploration in 1891. By J. THEODORE BENT. With 117 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Ball (JOHN).**  
*THE ALPINE GUIDE.* Reconstructed and Revised on behalf of the Alpine Club, by W. A. B. COOLIDGE.  
 Vol. I., *THE WESTERN ALPS:* the Alpine Region, South of the Rhone Valley, from the Col de Tenda to the Simplon Pass. With 9 New and Revised Maps. Crown 8vo., 12s. net.
- HINTS AND NOTES, PRACTICAL AND SCIENTIFIC, FOR TRAVELLERS IN THE ALPS:* being a Revision of the General Introduction to the 'Alpine Guide'. Crown 8vo., 3s. net.



## Travel and Adventure, the Colonies, &c.—continued.

### Brassey (THE LATE LADY).

*A VOYAGE IN THE 'SUNBEAM'; OUR HOME ON THE OCEAN FOR ELEVEN MONTHS.*

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 66 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 7s. 6d.

'Silver Library' Edition. With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Popular Edition. With 60 Illustrations. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

School Edition. With 37 Illustrations. Fcp., 2s. cloth, or 3s. white parchment.

*SUNSHINE AND STORM IN THE EAST.*

Popular Edition. With 103 Illustrations. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

*IN THE TRADES, THE TROPICS, AND THE 'ROARING FORTIES'.*

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 220 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 7s. 6d.

**Crawford.**—*SOUTH AMERICAN SKETCHES.* By ROBERT CRAWFORD, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Fountain.**—*THE GREAT DESERTS AND FORESTS OF NORTH AMERICA.* By PAUL FOUNTAIN. With a Preface by W. H. HUDSON, Author of 'The Naturalist in La Plata,' etc. 8vo., 9s. 6d. net.

### Froude (JAMES A.).

*OCEANA: or England and her Colonies.* With 9 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE ENGLISH IN THE WEST INDIES: or, the Bow of Ulysses.* With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

**Grove.**—*SEVENTY-ONE DAYS' CAMPING IN MOROCCO.* By LADY GROVE. With Photogravure Portrait and 32 Illustrations from Photographs.

**Haggard.**—*A WINTER PILGRIMAGE: Being an Account of Travels through Palestine, Italy and the Island of Cyprus, undertaken in the year 1900.* By H. RIDER HAGGARD. With 31 Illustrations from Photographs. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 12s. 6d. net.

**Heathcote.**—*ST. KILDA.* By NORMAN HEATHCOTE. With 80 Illustrations from Sketches and Photographs of the People, Scenery and Birds by the Author. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

**Howitt.**—*VISITS TO REMARKABLE PLACES.* Old Halls, Battle-Fields, Scenes, illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By WILLIAM HOWITT. With 80 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

### Knight (E. F.).

*WITH THE ROYAL TOUR: a Narrative of the Recent Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York through Greater Britain.* With 16 Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

### Knight (E. F.)—continued.

*THE CRUISE OF THE 'ALERT': the Narrative of a Search for Treasure on the Desert Island of Trinidad.* With 2 Maps and 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*WHERE THREE EMPIRES MEET: a Narrative of Recent Travel in Kashmir, Western Tibet, Baltistan, Ladak, Gilgit, and the adjoining Countries.* With a Map and 54 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE 'FALCON' ON THE BALTIC: a Voyage from London to Copenhagen in a Three-Tonner.* With 10 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Lees.**—*PEAKS AND PINES: another Norway Book.* By J. A. LEES. With 63 Illustrations and Photographs. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

**Lees and Clutterbuck.**—B.C. 1887: *A RAMBLE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.* By J. A. LEES and W. J. CLUTTERBUCK. With Map and 75 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Lynch.**—*ARMENIA: Travels and Studies.* By H. F. B. LYNCH. With 197 Illustrations (some in tints) reproduced from Photographs and Sketches by the Author, 16 Maps and Plans, a Bibliography, and a Map of Armenia and adjacent countries. 2 vols. Medium 8vo., gilt top. 42s. net.

**Nansen.**—*THE FIRST CROSSING OF GREENLAND.* By FRIDTJOF NANSEN. With 143 Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Rice.**—*OCCASIONAL ESSAYS ON NATIVE SOUTH INDIAN LIFE.* By STANLEY P. RICE, Indian Civil Service. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Smith.**—*CLIMBING IN THE BRITISH ISLES.* By W. P. HASKETT SMITH. With Illustrations and Numerous Plans.

Part I. *ENGLAND.* 16mo., 3s. net.

Part II. *WALES AND IRELAND.* 16mo., 3s. net.

**Spender.**—*THE WINTER IN NOW HILL.* being an Account of Two Holidays spent on Snow shoes and in Sleigh Driving, and including an Expedition to the Lapps. By A. EDMUND SPENDER. With 40 Illustrations from Photographs. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

**Stephen.**—*THE PLAY-GROUND OF EUROPE (The Alps).* By LESLIE STEPHEN. With 4 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Three in Norway.** By Two of Them. With a Map and 59 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

### Tyndall.—(JOHN).

*THE GLACIERS OF THE ALPS.* With 61 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

*HOURS OF EXERCISE IN THE ALPS.* With 7 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

## Sport and Pastime.

## THE BADMINTON LIBRARY.

Edited by HIS GRACE THE (EIGHTH) DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G.,  
and A. E. T. WATSON.

Crown 8vo., Cloth, Price 6s. net each Volume, or 9s. net each, half-bound in Leather,  
with gilt top.

**ARCHERY.** By C. J. LONGMAN and Col. H. WALROND. With Contributions by Miss LEGH, Viscount DILLON, etc. With 2 Maps, 23 Plates and 172 Illustrations in the Text.

**ATHLETICS.** By MONTAGUE SHEARMAN. With Chapters on Athletics at School by W. BEACHER THOMAS; Athletic Sports in America by C. H. SHERRILL; a Contribution on Paper-Chasing by W. RYE, and an Introduction by Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Q.C., M.P. With 12 Plates and 37 Illustrations in the Text.

**BIG GAME SHOOTING.** By CLIVE PHILLIPPS-WOLLEY.

Vol. I. AFRICA AND AMERICA. With Contributions by Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, W. C. OSWELL, F. C. SELOUS, etc. With 20 Plates and 57 Illustrations in the Text.

Vol. II. EUROPE, ASIA, AND THE ARCTIC REGIONS. With Contributions by Lieut.-Colonel R. HEBER PERCY, Major ALGERNON C. HEBER PERCY, etc. With 17 Plates and 56 Illustrations in the Text.

**BILLIARDS.** By Major W. BROADFOOT, R.E. With Contributions by A. H. BOYD SYDENHAM DIXON, W. J. FORD, etc. With 11 Plates, 19 Illustrations in the Text, and numerous Diagrams.

**COURSING AND FALCONRY.** By HARDING COX, CHARLES RICHARDSON, and the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES. With 20 Plates and 55 Illustrations in the Text.

**CRICKET.** By A. G. STEEL and the Hon. R. H. LYTTELTON. With Contributions by ANDREW LANG, W. G. GRACE, F. GALE, etc. With 13 Plates and 52 Illustrations in the Text.

**CYCLING.** By the EARL OF ALBEMARLE and G. LACY HILLIER. With 19 Plates and 44 Illustrations in the Text.

**DANCING.** By Mrs. LILLY GROVE, F.R.G.S. With Contributions by Miss MIDDLETON, The Hon. Mrs. ARMYTAGE, etc. With Musical Examples, and 38 Full-page Plates and 93 Illustrations in the Text.

**DRIVING.** By His Grace the (Eighth) Duke of BEAUFORT, K.G. With Contributions by A. E. T. WATSON the EARL OF ONSLOW, etc. With 12 Plates and 54 Illustrations in the Text.

**FENCING, BOXING, AND WRESTLING.** By WALTER H. POLLOCK, F. C. GROVE, C. PREVOST, E. B. MITCHELL, and WALTER ARMSTRONG. With 18 Plates and 24 Illustrations in the Text.

**FISHING.** By H. CHOI MONDELEY-PENNEL.

Vol. I. SALMON AND TROUT. With Contributions by H. R. FRANCIS, Major JOHN P. TRAHERNE, etc. With 9 Plates and numerous Illustrations of Tackle, etc.

Vol. II. PIKE AND OTHER COARSE FISH. With Contributions by the MARQUIS OF EXETER, WILLIAM SENIOR, G. CHRISTOPHER DAVIS, etc. With 7 Plates and numerous Illustrations of Tackle, etc.

**FOOTBALL HISTORY,** by MONTAGUE SHEARMAN; *THE ASSOCIATION GAME*, by W. J. OAKLEY and G. O. SMITH; *THE RUGBY UNION GAME*, by FRANK MITCHELL. With other Contributions by R. F. MACNAGHTEN, M. C. KEMP, J. B. VINCENT, WALLER CAMP and A. SUTHERLAND. With 19 Plates and 35 Illustrations in the Text.

**GOLF.** By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON. With Contributions by the Rt. Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P., Sir WALTER SIMPSON, Bart., ANDREW LANG, etc. With 32 Plates and 57 Illustrations in the Text.

**HUNTING.** By His Grace the (Eighth) Duke of BEAUFORT, K.G., and MORRIS MORRIS. With Contributions by the EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE, Rev. E. W. L. DAVIES, G. H. LONGMAN, etc. With 5 Plates and 54 Illustrations in the Text.

**MOUNTAINEERING.** By C. T. DENT. With Contributions by the Right Hon. J. BRUCE, M.P., Sir MARTIN CONWAY, D. W. FRESHFIELD, C. E. MATTHEWS, etc. With 13 Plates and 91 Illustrations in the Text.

## Sport and Pastime—continued.

### THE BADMINTON LIBRARY—continued.

Edited by HIS GRACE THE (EIGHTH) DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G.,  
and A. E. T. WATSON.

Crown 8vo., Cloth, Price 6s. net each Volume, or 9s. net each, half-bound in Leather,  
with gilt top.

**POETRY OF SPORT\* (THE).**—  
Selected by HEDLEY PEEK. With a  
Chapter on Classical Allusions to Sport by  
ANDREW LANG, and a Special Preface to  
the BADMINTON LIBRARY by A. E. T.  
WATSON. With 32 Plates and 74 Illustrations  
in the Text.

**RACING AND STEEPLE-CHAS-  
ING.** By the EARL OF SUFFOLK AND  
BERKSHIRE, W. G. CRAVEN, the Hon. F.  
LAWLEY, ARTHUR COVENTRY, and A. E. T.  
WATSON. With Frontispiece and 56 Illustrations  
in the Text.

**RIDING AND POLO.** By Captain  
ROBERT WEIR, J. MORAY BROWN, T. F.  
DALE, THE LATE DUKE OF BEAUFORT, THE  
EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE, etc.  
With 18 Plates and 41 Illusts. in the Text.

**ROWING.** By R. P. P. ROWE and  
C. M. PITMAN. With Chapters on Steering  
by C. P. SEROCOLD and F. C. BEGG; Metropolitan  
Rowing by S. LE BLANC SMITH;  
and on PUNTING by P. W. SQUIRE. With  
75 Illustrations.

**SEA FISHING.** By JOHN BICKER-  
DYKE, Sir H. W. GORE-BOOTH, ALFRED  
C. HARMSWORTH, and W. SENIOR. With 22  
Full-page Plates and 175 Illusts. in the Text.

#### SHOOTING.

Vol. I. FIELD AND COVERT. By LORD  
WALSINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-  
GALLWEY, Bart. With Contributions by  
the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES and A. J.  
STUART-WORTLEY. With 11 Plates and  
95 Illustrations in the Text.

Vol. II. MOOR AND MARSH. By  
LORD WALSINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-  
GALLWEY, Bart. With Contributions by  
LORD LOVAT and Lord CHARLES LENNOX  
KERR. With 8 Plates and 57 Illustrations  
in the Text.

**SKATING, CURLING, & TOBOG-  
GANING.** By J. M. HEATHCOTE, C. G.  
TEBBUTT, T. MAXWELL WITHAM, Rev.  
JOHN KERR, ORMOND HAKE, HENRY A.  
BUCK, etc. With 12 Plates and 272 Illustrations  
in the Text.

**SWIMMING.** By ARCHIBALD SIN-  
CLAIR and WILLIAM HENRY, Hon. Secs. of the  
Life-Saving Society. With 13 Plates and 112  
Illustrations in the Text.

**TENNIS, LAWN TENNIS,  
RACKETS AND FIVES.** By J. M. and  
C. G. HEATHCOTE, E. O. PLEYDELL-BOU-  
VERIE, and A. C. AINGER. With Contributions  
by the Hon. A. LATTEFLION, W. C. MAR-  
SHALL, Miss L. DOD, etc. With 12 Plates and  
67 Illustrations in the Text.

#### YACHTING.

Vol. I. CRUISING, CONSTRUCTION  
OF YACHTS, YACHT RACING  
RULES, FITTING-OUT, etc. By Sir  
EDWARD SULLIVAN, Bart., THE EARL OF  
PEMBROKE, LORD BRASSEY, K.C.B., C.  
E. SETH-SMITH, C.B., G. L. WATSON, R.  
T. PRITCHETT, E. F. KNIGHT, etc. With  
21 Plates and 93 Illustrations in the  
Text.

Vol. II. YACHT CLUBS, YACHT-  
ING IN AMERICA AND THE  
COLONIES, YACHT RACING, etc.  
By R. T. PRITCHETT, THE MARQUIS OF  
DUFFERIN AND AVA, K.P., THE EARL OF  
ONSLOW, JAMES MCFERRAN, etc. With  
35 Plates and 160 Illustrations in the  
Text.

## FUR, FEATHER, AND FIN SERIES.

Edited by A. E. T. WATSON.

Crown 8vo., price 5s. each Volume, cloth.

\* \* The Volumes are also issued half-bound in Leather, with gilt top, price 7s. 6d. net each.

**THE PARTRIDGE.** Natural His-  
tory, by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON;  
Shooting, by A. J. STUART-WORTLEY;  
Cookery, by GEORGE SAINTSBURY. With  
11 Illustrations and various Diagrams  
in the Text. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**THE GROUSE.** Natural History, by  
the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting,  
by A. J. STUART-WORTLEY; Cookery, by  
GEORGE SAINTSBURY. With 13 Illustrations  
and various Diagrams in the Text. Crown  
8vo., 5s.

## Sport and Pastime—continued.

## FUR, FEATHER, AND FIN SERIES—continued.

**THE PHEASANT.** Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting, by A. J. STUART-WORTLEY; Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 10 Illustrations and various Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5s. •

**THE HARE.** Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting, by the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES; Coursing, by CHARLES RICHARDSON; Hunting, by J. S. GIBBONS and G. H. LONGMAN; Cookery, by Col. KENNEY HERBERT. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**RED DEER.**—Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Deer Stalking, by CAMERON OF LOCHIEL; Stag Hunting, by Viscount EBRINGTON; Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 10 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Bickerdyke.**—*DAYS OF MY LIFE ON WATER, FRESH AND SALT*, and other Papers. By JOHN BICKERDYKE. With Photo-etching Frontispiece and 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Blackburne.**—*MR. BLACKBURN'S GAMES AT CHESS*. Selected, Annotated and Arranged by Himself. Edited, with a Biographical Sketch and a brief History of Blindfold Chess, by P. ANDERSON GRAHAM. With Portrait of Mr. Blackburne. 8vo., 7s. 6d. net.

**Cawthorne and Herod.**—*ROYAL ASCOT: its History and its Associations*. By GEORGE JAMES CAWTHORNE and RICHARD S. HEROD. With 32 Plates and 106 Illustrations in the Text. Demy 4to., £1 11s. 6d. net.

**Dead Shot (The):** or, Sportsman's Complete Guide. Being a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, with Rudimentary and Finishing Lessons in the Art of Shooting Game of all kinds. Also Game-driving, Wildfowl and Pigeon-shooting, Dog-breaking, etc. By MARKSMAN. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Ellis.**—*CHESS SPARKS*; or, Short and Bright Games of Chess. Collected and Arranged by J. H. ELLIS, M.A. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

**Folkard.**—*THE WILD-FOWLER*: A Treatise on Fowling, Ancient and Modern, descriptive also of Decoys and Flight-ponds, Wild-fowl Shooting, Gunning-punts, Shooting-yachts, etc. Also Fowling in the Fens and in Foreign Countries, Rock-fowling, etc., etc., by H. C. FOLKARD. With 13 Engravings on Steel, and several Woodcuts. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

**THE SALMON.** By the Hon. A. E. GATHORNE-HARDY. With Chapters on the Law of Salmon Fishing by CLAUD DOUGLAS PENNANT; Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 8 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

**THE TROUT.** By the MARQUESS OF GRANBY. With Chapters on the Breeding of Trout by Col. H. CUSTANCE; and Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 12 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**THE RABBIT.** By JAMES EDMUND HARTING. Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 10 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

**PIKE AND PERCH.** By WILLIAM SENIOR ('Redspinner,' Editor of the 'Field'). With Chapters by JOHN BICKERDYKE and W. H. POPE; Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 12 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Ford.**—*MIDDLESEX COUNTY CRICKET CLUB, 1864-1899*. Written and Compiled by W. J. FORD (at the request of the Committee of the County C.C.). With Frontispiece Portrait of Mr. V. E. Walker. 8vo., 10s. net.

**Ford.**—*THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ARCHERY*. By HORACE FORD. New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Re-written by W. BUTT, M.A. With a Preface by C. J. LONGMAN, M.A. 8vo., 14s.

**Francis.**—*A BOOK ON ANGLING: or, Treatise on the Art of Fishing in every Branch*; including full Illustrated List of Salmon Flies. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. With Portrait and Coloured Plates. Crown 8vo., 15s. •

**Fremantle.**—*THE BOOK OF THE RIFLE*. By the Hon. T. F. FREMANTLE, V.D., Major, 1st Bucks V.R.C. With 54 Plates and 107 Diagrams in the Text. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.

**Gathorne-Hardy.**—*AUTUMNS IN ARGYLLSHIRE WITH ROD AND GUN*. By the Hon. A. E. GATHORNE-HARDY. With 8 Photogravure Illustrations by ARCHIBALD THORBURN. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

**Graham.**—*COUNTRY PASTIMES FOR BOYS*. By P. ANDERSON GRAHAM. With 252 Illustrations from Drawings and Photographs. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.

**Hutchinson.**—*THE BOOK OF GOLF AND GOLFERS*. By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON. With Contributions by Miss AMY PASCOE, H. H. HILTON, J. H. TAYLOR, H. J. WHIGHAM, and MESSRS. SUTTON & SONS. With 71 Portraits from Photographs. Large crown 8vo., gilt top, 7s. 6d. net.

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

- Lang.**—*ANGLING SKETCHES.* By ANDREW LANG. With 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Lillie (ARTHUR).**  
*CROQUET: its History, Rules and Secrets.* With 4 Full-page Illustrations, 15 Illustrations in the Text, and 27 Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- CROQUET UP TO DATE.* Containing the Ideas and Teachings of the Leading Players and Champions. With Contributions by Lieut.-Col. the Hon. H. NEFDHAM, C. D. LOCOCK, etc. With 19 Illustrations (15 Portraits), and numerous Diagrams. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.
- Locock.**—*SIDE AND SCREEN:* being Notes on the Theory and Practice of the Game of Billiards. By C. D. LOCOCK. With Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.
- Longman.**—*CHESS OPENINGS.* By FREDERICK W. LONGMAN. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
- Mackenzie.**—*NOTES FOR HUNTING MEN.* By Captain CORTLAND GORDON MACKENZIE. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.
- Madden.**—*THE DIARY OF MASTER WILLIAM SILENCE:* a Study of Shakespeare and of Elizabethan Sport. By the Right Hon. D. H. MADDEN, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin. 8vo., gilt top, 16s.
- Maskelyne.**—*SHARPS AND FLATS:* a Complete Revelation of the Secrets of Cheating at Games of Chance and Skill. By JOHN NEVIL MASKELYNE, of the Egyptian Hall. With 62 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Millais.**—*THE WILDFOWLER IN SCOTLAND.* By JOHN GUILLE MILLAIS, F.Z.S., etc. With a Frontispiece in Photogravure by Sir J. E. MILLAIS, Bart., P.R.A., 8 Photogravure Plates, 2 Coloured Plates and 50 Illustrations from the Author's Drawings and from Photographs. Royal 16to., gilt top, 30s. net.
- Modern Bridge.**—By 'Slam'. With a Reprint of the Laws of Bridge, as adopted by the Portland and Turf Clubs. \*18mo., gilt edges, 3s. 6d.
- Park.**—*THE GAME OF GOLF.* By WILLIAM PARK, Jun., Champion Golfer, 1887-89. With 17 Plates and 26 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Payne-Gallwey (Sir RALPH, Bart.).**  
*LETTERS TO YOUNG SHOOTERS* (First Series). On the Choice and use of a Gun. With 41 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.  
*LETTERS TO YOUNG SHOOTERS* (Second Series). On the Production, Preservation, and Killing of Game. With Directions in Shooting Wood-Pigeons and Breaking-in Retrievers. With Portrait and 103 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.  
*LETTERS TO YOUNG SHOOTERS.* (Third Series.) Comprising a Short Natural History of the Wildfowl that are Rare or Common to the British Islands, with complete directions in Shooting Wildfowl on the Coast and Inland. With 200 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 18s.
- Pole.**—*THE THEORY OF THE MODERN SCIENTIFIC GAME OF WHIST.* By WILLIAM POLE, F.R.S. Fcp. 8vo., gilt edges, 2s. net.
- Proctor.**—*HOW TO PLAY WHIST: WITH THE LAWS AND ETIQUETTE OF WHIST.* By RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.
- Ronalds.**—*THE FLY-FISHER'S ENTOMOLOGY.* By ALFRED RONALDS. With 20 coloured Plates. 8vo., 14s.
- Selous.**—*SPORT AND TRAVEL, PAST AND PRESENT.* By FREDERICK COURTENAY SELOUS. With 18 Plates and 35 Illustrations in the Text. Medium 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.

## Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy.

## LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &amp;c.

- Abbott.**—*THE ELEMENTS OF LOGIC.* By T. K. ABBOTT B.D. 12mo., 3s.
- Aristotle.**  
*THE ETHICS:* Greek Text, Illustrated with Essay and Notes. By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart. 2 vols. 8vo., 32s.  
*AN INTRODUCTION TO ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS.* Books I.-IV. (Book X. c. vi.-ix. in an Appendix). With a continuous Analysis and Notes. By the Rev. E. MOORE, D.D. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Bacon (FRANCIS).**  
*COMPLETE WORKS.* Edited by R. L. ELLIS, JAMES SPEDDING and D. D. HEATH. 7 vols. 8vo., £3 13s. 6d.  
*LETTERS AND LIFE,* including all his occasional Works. Edited by JAMES SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo., £4 4s.  
*THE ESSAYS:* with Annotations. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D. 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*THE ESSAYS:* with Notes. By F. STORR and C. H. GIBSON. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

# Mental, Moral and Political Philosophy—continued.

LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &c.

**Bacon (FRANCIS)**—continued.

*THE ESSAYS*: with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. 2 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 6s. The Text and Index only, without Introduction and Notes, in One Volume. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

**Bain (ALEXANDER)**.

*DISSERTATIONS ON LEADING PHILOSOPHICAL TOPICS*: being Articles reprinted from "Mind". [In the press.]

*MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE*: a Compendium of Psychology and Ethics. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Or separately,

Part I. *PSYCHOLOGY AND HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY*. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.

Part II. *THEORY OF ETHICS AND ETHICAL SYSTEMS*. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

*LOGIC*. Part I. *DEDUCTION*. Cr. 8vo., 4s. Part II. *INDUCTION*. Cr. 8vo., 6s. 6d.

*SENSES AND THE INTELLECT*. 8vo., 15s.

*EMOTIONS AND THE WILL*. 8vo., 15s.

*PRACTICAL ESSAYS*. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

**Bray.**—*THE PHILOSOPHY OF NECESSITY*: or, Law in Mind as in Matter. By CHARLES BRAY. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Crozier (JOHN BEATTIE)**.

*CIVILISATION AND PROGRESS*: being the Outlines of a New System of Political, Religious and Social Philosophy. 8vo., 14s.

*HISTORY OF INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT*, on the Lines of Modern Evolution.

Vol. I. 8vo., 14s.

Vol. II. (In preparation)

Vol. III. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Davidson.** *THE LOGIC OF DEFINITION*, Explained and Applied. By WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Green (THOMAS HILL)**.—*THE WORKS OF*. Edited by R. L. NETTLESHIP. Vols. I. and II. *Philosophical Works*. 8vo., 16s. each.

Vol. III. *Miscellanies*. With Index to the three Volumes, and Memoir. 8vo., 21s.

*LECTURES ON THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL OBLIGATION*. With Preface by BERNARD BOSANQUET. 8vo., 5s.

**Gurnhill.**—*THE MORALS OF SUICIDE*. By the Rev. J. GURNHILL, B.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Hodgson (SHADWORTH H.)**

*TIME AND SPACE*: A Metaphysical Essay. 8vo., 16s.

*THE THEORY OF PRACTICE*: an Ethical Inquiry. 2 vols. 8vo., 24s.

*THE PHILOSOPHY OF REFLECTION*. 2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

*THE METAPHYSIC OF EXPERIENCE*.

Book I. General Analysis of Experience; Book II. Positive Science; Book III. Analysis of Conscious Action; Book IV. The Real Universe. 4 vols. 8vo., 36s. net.

**Hume.**—*THE PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS OF DAVID HUME*. Edited by T. H. GREEN and T. H. GROSE. 4 vols. 8vo., 28s. Or separately, *ESSAYS*. 2 vols. 14s. *TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE*. 2 vols. 14s.

**James.**—*THE WILL TO BELIEVE*, and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy. By WILLIAM JAMES, M.D., LL.D., etc. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Justinian.**—*THE INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN*: Latin Text, chiefly that of Huschke, with English Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Summary. By THOMAS C. SANDARS, M.A. 8vo., 18s.

**Kant (IMMANUEL)**.

*CRITIQUE OF PRACTICAL REASON, AND OTHER WORKS ON THE THEORY OF ETHICS*. Translated by T. K. ABBOTT, B.D. With Memoir. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

*FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS*. Translated by T. K. ABBOTT, B.D. Crown 8vo., 3s.

*INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC, AND HIS ESSAY ON THE MISTAKEN SUBLTLY OF THE FOUR FIGURES*. Translated by T. K. ABBOTT. 8vo., 6s.

**Kelly.**—*GOVERNMENT OR HUMAN EVOLUTION*. By EDMOND KELLY, M.A., F.G.S. Vol. I. *Justice*. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net. Vol. II. *Collectivism and Individualism*. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

**Killick.**—*HANDBOOK TO MILL'S SYSTEM OF LOGIC*. By Rev. A. H. KILLICK, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Ladd (GEORGE TRUMBULL)**.

*ELEMENTS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY*. 8vo., 21s.

*OUTLINES OF DESCRIPTIVE PSYCHOLOGY*: a Text-Book of Mental Science for Colleges and Normal Schools. 8vo., 12s.

*OUTLINES OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY*. 8vo., 12s.

*PRIMER OF PSYCHOLOGY*. Cr. 5s. 6d.

**Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy—continued.**

- Lecky.**—*THE MAP OF LIFE: Conduct and Character.* By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. Library Edition, 8vo., 10s. 6d. Cabinet Edition, Cr. 8vo., 5s. net.
- Leighton.**—*TYPICAL MODERN CONCEPTIONS OF GOD: or, The Absolute of German Romantic Idealism and of English Evolutionary Agnosticism.* With a Constructive Essay. By JOSEPH ALEXANDER LEIGHTON. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.
- Lutoslawski.**—*THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF PLATO'S LOGIC.* With an Account of Plato's Style and of the Chronology of his Writings. By WINCENTY LUTOSLAWSKI. 8vo., 21s.
- Max Muller (F.).**  
*THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT.* 8vo., 21s.  
*THE SIX SYSTEMS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.* 8vo., 18s.  
*THREE LECTURES ON THE VEDANTA PHILOSOPHY.* Crown 8vo., 5s.
- Mill (JOHN STUART).**  
*A SYSTEM OF LOGIC.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*ON LIBERTY.* Crown 8vo., 1s. 4d.  
*CONSIDERATIONS ON REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.* Crown 8vo., 2s.  
*UTILITARIANISM.* 8vo., 2s. 6d.  
*EXAMINATION OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY.* 8vo., 16s.  
*NATURE, THE UTILITY OF RELIGION, AND THEISM.* Three Essays. 8vo., 5s.
- Monck.**—*AN INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC.* By W. H. S. MONCK, M.A. Cr. 8vo., 15s.
- Pierce.**—*STUDIES IN AUDITORY AND VISUAL SPACE PERCEPTION.* Essays on Experimental Psychology. By A. H. PIERCE. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.
- Richmond.**—*THE MIND OF A CHILD.* By ENNIS RICHMOND. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.
- Romanes.**—*MIND AND MOTION AND MONISM.* By GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.
- Sully (JAMES).**  
*THE HUMAN MIND: a Text-book of Psychology.* 2 vols. 8vo., 21s  
*OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY.* Crown 8vo., 9s.  
*THE TEACHER'S HANDBOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY.* Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.
- Sully (JAMES)—continued.**  
*STUDIES OF CHILDHOOD.* 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*CHILDREN'S WAYS: being Selections from the Author's 'Studies of Childhood'.* With 25 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.
- Sutherland.**—*THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE MORAL INSTINCT.* By ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo., 28s.
- Swinburne.**—*PICTURE LOGIC: an Attempt to Popularise the Science of Reasoning.* By ALFRED JAMES SWINBURNE, M.A. With 23 Woodcuts. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
- Thomas.**—*INTUITIVE SUGGESTION.* By J. W. THOMAS, Author of 'Spiritual Law in the Natural World,' etc. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.
- Webb.**—*THE VEIL OF ISIS: a Series of Essays on Idealism.* By THOMAS E. WEBB, LL.D., Q.C. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
- Weber.**—*HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.* By ALFRED WEBER, Professor in the University of Strasburg. Translated by FRANK THILLY, Ph.D. 8vo., 16s.
- Whately (ARCHBISHOP).**  
*BACON'S ESSAYS.* With Annotations. 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*ELEMENTS OF LOGIC.* Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.  
*ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC.* Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.
- Zeller (Dr. EDWARD).**  
*THE STOICS, EPICUREANS, AND SCEPTICS.* Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo., 15s.  
*OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY.* Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE and EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*PLATO AND THE OLDER ACADEMY.* Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE and ALFRED GOODWIN, B.A. Crown 8vo., 18s.  
*SOCRATES AND THE SOCRATIC SCHOOLS.* Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*ARISTOTLE AND THE EARLIER PERIPATETICS.* Translated by B. F. C. COSTELLOE, M.A., and J. H. MUIRHEAD, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 24s.

**STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.**

- A MANUAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.* By C. S. DEVAS, M.A. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- FIRST PRINCIPLES OF KNOWLEDGE.* By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- GENERAL METAPHYSICS.* By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- LOGIC.* By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- MORAL PHILOSOPHY (ETHICS AND NATURAL LAW).* By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- NATURAL THEOLOGY.* By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.
- PSYCHOLOGY.* By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Litt., M.A. (Lond.). Cr. 8vo., 6s. 6d.

## History and Science of Language, &amp;c.

**Davidson.**—*LEADING AND IMPORTANT ENGLISH WORDS*: Explained and Exemplified. By WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON, M.A. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Farrar.**—*LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES*. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Graham.**—*ENGLISH SYNONYMS*, Classified and Explained: with Practical Exercises. By G. F. GRAHAM. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

**Max Muller (F.).**

*THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE*. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10s.

**Max Muller (F.)**—*continued*.

*BIOGRAPHIES OF WORDS, AND THE HOME OF THE ARIAS*. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP*. Vol. III. *ESSAYS ON LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE*. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*LAST ESSAYS*. First Series. *Essays on Language, Folklore and other Subjects*. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Roget.**—*THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES*. Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By PIERRE MARK ROGET, M.D., F.R.S. With full Index. Crown 8vo., 9s. net.

## Political Economy and Economics.

**Ashley (W. J.).**

*ENGLISH ECONOMIC HISTORY AND THEORY*. Crown 8vo., Part I., 5s. Part II., 10s. 6d.

*SURVEYS, HISTORICAL AND ECONOMIC*. Crown 8vo., 9s. net.

**Bagehot.**—*ECONOMIC STUDIES*. By WALTER BAGEHOT. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Barnett.**—*PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM*: Essays on Social Reform. By SAMUEL A. and HENRIETTA BARNETT. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Devas.**—*A MANUAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY*. By C. S. DEVAS, M.A. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d. (*Stonyhurst Philosophical Series*.)

**Lawrence.**—*LOCAL VARIATIONS IN WAGES*. By F. W. LAWRENCE, M.A. With Index and 18 Maps and Diagrams. 4to. 8s. 6d.

**Leslie.**—*ESSAYS ON POLITICAL ECONOMY*. By T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE, Hon. LL.D., Dubl. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Macleod (HENRY DUNNING).**

*ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS*. Crown 8vo., 2s.

*THE ELEMENTS OF ECONOMICS*. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

*BIMETALLISM*. 8vo., 5s. net.

*THE ELEMENTS OF BANKING*. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF BANKING*. Vol. I. 8vo., 12s. Vol. II. 14s.

**Macleod (HENRY DUNNING)**—*contd.*

*THE THEORY OF CREDIT*. 8vo. In 1 Vol., 30s. net; or separately, Vol. I., 10s. net. Vol. II., Part I., 10s. net. Vol II., Part II. 10s. net.

*INDIAN CURRENCY*. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

**Mill.**—*POLITICAL ECONOMY*. By JOHN STUART MILL. *Popular Edition*. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. *Library Edition*. 2 vols. 8vo., 30s.

**Mulhall.**—*INDUSTRIES AND WEALTH OF NATIONS*. By MICHAEL G. MULHALL, F.S.S. With 32 Diagrams. Cr. 8vo., 8s. 6d.

**Spahr.**—*AMERICA'S WORKING PEOPLE*. By CHARLES B. SPAHR. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

**Symes.**—*POLITICAL ECONOMY*: a Short Text-book of Political Economy. With Problems for Solution. Hints for Supplementary Reading, and a Supplementary Chapter on Socialism. By J. E. SYMES, M.A. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

**Toynbee.**—*LECTURES ON THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION OF THE 18TH CENTURY IN ENGLAND*. By ARNOLD TOYNBEE. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Webb (SIDNEY and BEATRICE).**

*THE HISTORY OF TRADE UNIONISM*. With Map and Bibliography. 8vo., 18s.

*INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY: a Study in Trade Unionism*. 2 vols. 8vo., 12s. net.

*PROBLEMS OF MODERN INDUSTRY: Essays*. 8vo., 7s. 6d.



## Evolution, Anthropology, &c.

**Clodd (EDWARD).**

*THE STORY OF CREATION:* a Plain Account of Evolution. With 77 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*A PRIMER OF EVOLUTION:* being a Popular Abridged Edition of 'The Story of Creation'. With Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

**Lubbock.**—*THE ORIGIN OF CIVILISATION*, and the Primitive Condition of Man. By Sir J. LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P. (LORD AVEBURY). With 5 Plates and 20 Illustrations. 8vo., 18s.

**Packard.**—*LAMARCK, THE FOUNDER OF EVOLUTION:* his Life and Work, with Translations of his Writings on Organic Evolution. By ALPHUS S. PACKARD, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Zoology and Geology in Brown University. With 10 Portrait and other Illustrations. Large Crown 8vo., 9s. net.

**Romanes (GEORGE JOHN)**

*ESSAYS.* Edited by C. LLOYD MORGAN. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*DARWIN, AND AFTER DARWIN:* an Exposition of the Darwinian Theory, and a Discussion on Post-Darwinian Questions. Part I. THE DARWINIAN THEORY. With Portrait of Darwin and 125 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Part II. POST-DARWINIAN QUESTIONS. Heredity and Utility. With Portrait of the Author and 5 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Part III. Post-Darwinian Questions. Isolation and Physiological Selection. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*AN EXAMINATION OF WEISMANNISM.* Crown 8vo., 6s.

## The Science of Religion, &c.

**Balfour.**—*THE FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF:* being Notes Introductory to the Study of Theology. By the Right Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR. Cr. 8vo., 6s. net.

**Baring-Gould.**—*THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF.* By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

**Campbell.**—*RELIGION IN GREEK LITERATURE.* By the Rev. LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 15s.

**Davidson.**—*THEISM*, as Grounded in Human Nature, Historically and Critically Handled. Being the Burnett Lectures for 1892 and 1893, delivered at Aberdeen. By W. L. DAVIDSON, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 15s.

**Lang (ANDREW).**

*MAGIC AND RELIGION.* 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*CUSTOM AND MYTH:* Studies of Early Usage and Belief. With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*MYTH, RITUAL, AND RELIGION.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s.

*MODERN MYTHOLOGY:* a Reply to Professor Max Müller. 8vo., 9s.

*THE MAKING OF RELIGION.* Cr. 8vo., 5s. net.

**Max Müller (The Right Hon. F.).**

*CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP.* Vol. IV. Essays on Mythology and Folk Lore. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*THE SIX SYSTEMS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.* 8vo., 18s.

*CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SCIENCE OF MYTHOLOGY.* 2 vols. 8vo., 32s.

**Max Müller (The Right Hon. F.)**  
*continued.*

*THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION*, as illustrated by the Religions of India. The Hibbert Lectures, delivered at the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, in 1878. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION:* Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*NATURAL RELIGION.* The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1888. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*PHYSICAL RELIGION.* The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1890. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*ANTHROPOLOGICAL RELIGION.* The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1891. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

*THEOSOLOGY, OR PSYCHOLOGICAL RELIGION.* The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1892. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*THREE LECTURES ON THE VEDĀNTA PHILOSOPHY*, delivered at the Royal Institution in March, 1894. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

*LAST ESSAYS.* Second Series. Essays on the Science of Religion. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Wood-Martin (W. G.).**

*TRACES OF THE ELDER FAITHS OF IRELAND:* a Folklore Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Traditions. With 192 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo., 30s. net.

*PAGAN IRELAND:* an Archæological Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Antiquities. With 512 Illustrations. 8vo., 15s.

## Classical Literature, Translations, &c.

- Abbott.**—*HELLENICA*. A Collection of Essays on Greek Poetry, Philosophy, History, and Religion. Edited by EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Æschylus.**—*EUMENIDES OF ÆSCHYLUS*. With Metrical English Translation. By J. F. DAVIES. 8vo., 7s.
- Aristophanes.**—*THE ACHARNIANS OF ARISTOPHANES*, translated into English Verse. By R. Y. TYRRELL. Crown 8vo., 1s.
- Becker (W. A.)**, Translated by the Rev. F. METCALFE, B.D.
- GALLUS**: or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. With Notes and Excursuses. With 26 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- CHARICLES**: or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. With Notes and Excursuses. With 26 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Campbell.**—*RELIGION IN GREEK LITERATURE*. By the Rev. LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D., Emeritus Professor of Greek, University of St. Andrews. 8vo., 15s.
- Cicero.**—*CICERO'S CORRESPONDENCE*. By R. Y. TYRRELL. Vols. I., II., III., 8vo., each 12s. Vol. IV., 15s. Vol. V., 14s. Vol. VI., 12s. Vol. VII. Index, 7s. 6d.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.** Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Vols. XI. and XII. 1900 and 1901. 8vo., 6s. 6d. net each.
- Hime.**—*LUCIA, THE SIKKIM SIKHIST*. By Lieut.-Col. HENRY W. L. HIME, (late) Royal Artillery. 8vo., 5s. net.
- Homer.**
- THE ILLAD OF HOMER*. Freely rendered into English Prose for the use of those who cannot read the original. By SAMUEL BUTLER. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- THE ODYSSEY*. Rendered into English Prose for the use of those who cannot read the original. By SAMUEL BUTLER. With 4 Maps and 7 Illustrations. 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER*. Done into English Verse. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Horace.**—*THE WORKS OF HORACE, RENDERED INTO ENGLISH PROSE*. With Life, Introduction and Notes. By WILLIAM COUTTS, M.A. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.
- Keller.**—*HOMERIC SOCIETY*: a Sociological Study of the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey'. By ALBERT GALLOWAY KELLER, Ph.D. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.
- Lucan.**—*THE PHARSALIA OF LUCAN*. Translated into Blank Verse. By Sir EDWARD RIDLEY. 8vo., 14s.
- Mackail.**—*SELECT EPIGRAMS FROM THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY*. By J. W. MACKAIL. Edited with a Revised Text, Introduction, Translation, and Notes. 8vo., 16s.
- Ogilvie.**—*HORAE LATINAE*: Studies in Synonyms and Syntax. By the late ROBERT OGILVIE, M.A., LL.D., H.M. Chief Inspector of Schools for Scotland. Edited by ALEXANDER SOUTER, M.A. With a Memoir by JOSEPH OGILVIE, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.
- Rich.**—*A DICTIONARY OF ROMAN AND GREEK ANTIQUITIES*. By A. RICH, B.A. With 2000 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.
- Sophocles.**—Translated into English Verse. By ROBERT WHITTLAW, M.A., Assistant Master in Rugby School. Cr. 8vo., 8s. 6d.
- Tyrrell.**—*DUBLIN TRANSLATIONS INTO GREEK AND LATIN VERSE*. Edited by R. Y. TYRRELL. 8vo., 6s.
- Virgil.**
- THE POEMS OF VIRGIL*. Translated into English Prose by JOHN CONINGTON. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL*. Translated into English Verse by JOHN CONINGTON. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- THE ÆNEIDS OF VIRGIL*. Done into English Verse. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL*, freely translated into English Blank Verse. By W. J. THORNHILL. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.
- THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL*. Translated into English Verse by JAMES RHODES. Books I.-VI. Crown 8vo., 5s. Books VII.-XII. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- THE ECILOGUES AND GEORGICS OF VIRGIL*. Translated into English Prose by J. W. MACKAIL, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. 16mo., 5s.
- Wilkins.**—*THE GROWTH OF THE HOMERIC POEMS*. By G. WILKINS. 8vo., 6s.

## Poetry and the Drama.

**Arnold.**—*THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD:* or, *The Great Consummation.* By Sir EDWIN ARNOLD. With 14 Illustrations after HOLMAN HUNT. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

**Bell (Mrs. HUGH).**

*CHAMBER COMEDIES:* a Collection of Plays and Monologues for the Drawing Room. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*FAIRY TALE PLAYS, AND HOW TO ACT THEM.* With 91 Diagrams and 52 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. net.

*RUMPELTILTZEKIN:* a Fairy Play in Five Scenes (Characters, 7 Male; 1 Female). From 'Fairy Tale Plays and How to Act Them'. With Illustrations, Diagrams and Music. Cl. 8vo., sewed, 6d.

**Bird.**—*RONALD'S FAREWELL,* and other Verses. By GEORGE BIRD, M.A., Vicar of Bradwell, Derbyshire. Fcp. 8vo., 4s. 6d. net.

**Dabney.**—*THE MUSICAL BASIS OF VERSE:* a Scientific Study of the Principles of Poetic Composition. By J. P. DABNEY. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

**Goethe.**—*THE FIRST PART OF THE TRAGEDY OF FAUST IN ENGLISH.* By THOS. E. WEBB, LL.D., sometime Fellow of Trinity College; Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, etc. New and Cheaper Edition, with *THE DEATH OF FAUST*, from the Second Part. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Ingelow (JEAN).**

*POETICAL WORKS.* Complete in One Volume. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 6s. net.

*LYRICAL AND OTHER POEMS.* Selected from the Writings of JEAN INGELow. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. cloth plain, 3s. cloth gilt.

**Lang (ANDREW).**

*GRASS OF PARNASSUS.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*THE BLUE POETRY BOOK.* Edited by ANDREW LANG. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.

**Lecky.**—*POEMS.* By the Right Hon. W. E. H. LECKY. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

**Lytton (THE EARL OF), (OWEN MEREDITH).**

*THE WANDERER.* Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

*LUCILE.* Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

*SELECTED POEMS.* Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

**Macaulay.**—*LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME,* WITH 'IVRY' AND 'THE ARMADA'. By Lord MACAULAY.

Illustrated by G. SCHARF. Fcp. 4to., 10s. 6d.

Bijou Edition.  
18mo., 2s. 6d. gilt top.

-- Popular Edition.

Fcp. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

Illustrated by J. R. WEGUELIN. Crown 8vo., 3s. net.

Annotated Edition. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth.

**MacDonald.**—*A BOOK OF STRIFE, IN THE FORM OF THE DIARY OF AN OLD SOUL:* Poems. By GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D. 18mo., 6s.

**Moon.**—*POEMS OF LOVE AND HOME.* By GEORGE WASHINGTON MOON, Hon. F.R.S.I. With Portrait. 16mo., 2s. 6d.

**Morris (WILLIAM).**

*POETICAL WORKS—LIBRARY EDITION.* Complete in 11 volumes. Crown 8vo., price 5s. net each.

*THE EARTHLY PARADISE.* 4 vols. Crown 8vo., 5s. net each.

*THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JASON.* Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*THE DEFENCE OF GUENEVERE,* and other Poems. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*THE STORY OF SIGURD THE VOLSUNG, AND THE FALL OF THE NIBELUNGS.* Cr. 8vo., 5s. net.

*POEMS BY THE WAY, AND LOVE IS ENOUGH.* Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER.* Done into English Verse. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*THE ÆNEIDS OF VIRGIL.* Done into English Verse. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

*THE TALE OF BEOWULF, SOMETIME KING OF THE FOLK OF THE WEDERGEATS.* Translated by WILLIAM MORRIS and A. J. WYATT. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

Certain of the *POETICAL WORKS* may also be had in the following Editions:—

*THE EARTHLY PARADISE.*

Popular Edition. 5 vols. 12mo., 25s.; or 5s. each, sold separately.

The same in Ten Parts, 25s.; or 2s. 6d. each, sold separately.

Cheap Edition, in 1 vol. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

*POEMS BY THE WAY.* Square crown 8vo., 6s.

\* For Mr. William Morris's other Works, see pp. 23, 30 and 32.

## Poetry and the Drama—*continued.*

**Morte Arthure:** an Alliterative Poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited from the Thornton MS., with Introduction, Notes and Glossary. By MARY MACLEOD BANKS. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Nesbit.**—*LAYS AND LEGENDS.* By E. NESBIT (Mrs. HUBERT BLAND). First Series. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. Second Series. With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Ramal.**—*SONGS OF CHILDHOOD.* By WALTER RAMAL. With a Frontispiece from a Drawing by RICHARD DOYLE. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.

**Riley.**—*OLD FASHIONED ROSAS:* Poems. By JAMES WHITCOMBE RILEY. 12mo., gilt top, 5s.

**Romanes.**—*A SELECTION FROM THE POEMS OF GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.* With an Introduction by T. HERBERT WARREN, President of Magdalen College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

## Shakespeare.

*BOWDLER'S FAMILY SHAKESPEARE.* With 36 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo., 14s. Or in 6 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 21s.

*THE SHAKESPEARE BIRTHDAY BOOK.* By MARY F. DUNBAR. 32mo., 1s. 6d.

**Savage-Armstrong.**—*BALLADS OF DOUV.* By G. F. SAVAGE-ARMSTRONG, M.A., LLitt. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

**Stevenson.**—*A CHILD'S GARDEN OF VERSES.* By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

**Wagner.**—*THE NIBELUNGEN RING.* Done into English Verse by REGINALD RANKIN, B.A. of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

Vol. I. Rhine Gold, The Valkyrie. Fcp. 8vo., gilt top, 4s. 6d.

Vol. II. Siegfried, The Twilight of the Gods. Fcp. 8vo. gilt top, 4s. 6d.

## Fiction, Humour, &c.

### Anstey (F.)

*VOCES POPULI* (Reprinted from 'Punch'.)

First Series. With 20 Illustrations by J. BERNARD PARTRIDGE. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 3s. net.

Second Series. With 25 Illustrations by J. BERNARD PARTRIDGE. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 3s. net.

*THE MAY FROM BLANKLY'S*, and other Sketches. (Reprinted from 'Punch'.) With 2 Illustrations by J. BERNARD PARTRIDGE. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 3s. net.

**Bailey.**—*A LADY OF ORANGE:* a Romance of the Netherlands in the Days of Alva. By H. C. BAILEY. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

### Beaconsfield (THE EARL OF).

*NOVELS AND TALES.* Complete in 11 vols. Crown 8vo., 15. 6d. each, or in sets, 11 vols., gilt top, 15s. net.

Vivian Grey.	Sybil
The Young Duke, etc.	Henrietta Temple.
Alroy, Ixion, etc.	Venetia.
Contarini Fleming, etc.	Coningsby.
	Lothair.
Tancred.	Endymion.

*NOVELS AND TALES. THE HUGH-ENDEN EDITION.* With 2 Portraits and 11 Vignettes. 11 Vols. Crown 8vo., 42s.

**Churchill.**—*SARROLA:* a Tale of the Revolution in Laurana. By WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL, M.P. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

**Crawford.**—*THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A TRAMP.* By J. H. CRAWFORD. With a Photogravure Frontispiece 'The Vagrants,' by FRID. WALKER, and 8 other Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

**Creed.**—*THE VICAR OF ST. LUKES.* By SIMY CREED. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Dougall.**—*BEGGARS ALL.* By L. DOUGALL. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

### Doyle (A. CONAN).

*MICAH CLARKE:* A Tale of Monmouth's Rebellion. With 10 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE REFUGEES:* A Tale of the Huguenots. With 25 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE STARK MUNKO LETTERS.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE CAPTAIN OF THE POLESTAR,* and other Tales. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Dyson.** *THE GOLD-STEALERS:* a Story of Waddy. By EDWARD DYSON. Author of 'Rhymes from the Mines,' etc. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Farrar (F. W., DEAN OF CANTERBURY).**

*DARKNESS AND DAWN:* or, Scenes in the Days of Nero. An Historic Tale. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 6s. net.

*GATHERING CLOUDS:* a Tale of the Days of St. Chrysostom. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 6s. net.

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.***Fowler (EDITH H.).***THE YOUNG PRETENDERS.* A Story of Child Life. With 12 Illustrations by Sir PHILIP BURNE-JONES, Bart. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE PROFESSOR'S CHILDREN.* With 24 Illustrations by ETHEL KATE BURGESS. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Francis (M. E.).***FLANDER'S WIDOW.* Cr. 8vo., 6s.*YEOMAN FLEETWOOD.* With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo., 3s. net.*PASTORALS OF DORSET.* With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Froude.**—*THE TWO CHIEFS OF DUNBOY:* an Irish Romance of the Last Century. By JAMES A. FROUDE. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Gurdon.**—*MEMORIES AND FANCIES:* Suffolk Tales and other Stories; Fairy Legends; Poems; Miscellaneous Articles. By the late LADY CAMILLA GURDON. Cr. 8vo., 5s.**Haggard (H. RIDER).***ALLAN QUATERMAIN.* With 31 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*ALLAN'S WIFE.* With 34 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*BEATRICE.* With Frontispiece and Vignette. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*BLACK HEART AND WHITE HEART, AND OTHER STORIES.* With 33 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*CLEOPATRA.* With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*COLONEL QUARITCH, V.C.* With Frontispiece and Vignette. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*DAWN.* With 16 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*DR. THERNE.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*ERIC BRIGHTYES.* With 51 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*HEART OF THE WORLD.* With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*JOAN HASTE.* With 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*MAIWA'S REVENGE.* Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.*LYSBETH.* With 26 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Haggard (H. RIDER)—continued.***MONTEZUMA'S DAUGHTER.* With 24 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*MR. MEESON'S WILL.* With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*NADA THE LILY.* With 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*SHE.* With 32 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*SHILLOH:* a Tale of the Great Trek. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE PEOPLE OF THE MIST.* With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE WITCH'S HEAD.* With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Haggard and Lang.**—*THE WORLD'S DESIRE.* By H. RIDER HAGGARD and ANDREW LANG. With 27 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Harte.**—*IN THE CAQUINEZ WOODS.* By BRET HARTE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Hope.**—*THE HEART OF PRINCESS OSRA.* By ANTHONY HOPE. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Howard (Lady MABEL).***THE UNDOING OF JOHN BREWSTER.* Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE FAILURE OF SUCCESS.* Crown 8vo., 6s.**Jerome.**—*SKETCHES IN LAVENDER: BLUE AND GREEN.* By JEROME K. JEROME, Author of 'Three Men in a Boat,' etc. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Joyce.**—*OLD CELTIC ROMANCES.* Twelve of the most beautiful of the Ancient Irish Romantic Tales. Translated from the Gaelic. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Lang.**—*A MONK OF FIFE;* a Story of the Days of Joan of Arc. By ANDREW LANG. With 13 Illustrations by SELWYN IMAGE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.***Lyll (EDNA).***THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SLANDER.*  
Fcp. 8vo., 1s., sewed.

Presentation Edition. With 20 Illustrations by LANCELOT SPEED. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A TRUTH.*  
Fcp. 8vo., 1s., sewed; 1s. 6d., cloth.*DOREEN.* The Story of a Singer.  
Crown 8vo., 6s.*WAYFARING MEN.* Crown 8vo., 6s.*HOPE THE HERMIT:* a Romance of Borrowdale. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Marchmont.**—*IN THE NAME OF A WOMAN.* a Romance. By ARTHUR W. MARCHMONT. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Mason and Lang.** *PARSON KELLY.*  
By A. E. W. MASON and ANDREW LANG.  
Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Max Müller.**—*DEUTSCHE LIEBE (GERMAN LOVE):* Fragments from the Papers of an Alien. Collected by F. MAX MÜLLER. Translated from the German by G. A. M. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 5s.**Melville (G. J. WHYTE).**

The Gladiators.	Holmby House.
The Interpreter.	Kate Coventry.
Good for Nothing.	Digby Grand.
The Queen's Maries.	General Bounce.

Crown 8vo., 1s. 6d. each.

**Merriman.**—*FIOTSAM:* A Story of the Indian Mutiny. By HENRY SETON MERRIMAN. With Frontispiece and Vignette by H. G. MASSIE. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Morris (WILLIAM).***THE SUNDERING FLOOD.* Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.*THE WATER OF THE WONKROUS ISLES.* Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.*THE WELL AT THE WORLD'S END.*  
2 vols. 8vo., 28s.*THE WOOD BEYOND THE WORLD.*  
Crown 8vo., 6s. net.*THE STORY OF THE GUTTERING PLAIN,* which has been also called *The Land of the Living Men, or The Acre of the Undying.* Square post 8vo., 5s. net.*THE ROOTS OF THE MOUNTAINS,* wherein is told somewhat of the Lives of the Men of Burgdale, their Friends, their Neighbours, their Foemen, and their Fellows-in-Arms. Written in Prose and Verse. Square crown 8vo., 8s.**Morris (WILLIAM)—continued.***A TALE OF THE HOUSE OF THE WOLFINGS,* and all the Kindreds of the Mark. Written in Prose and Verse. Square crown 8vo., 6s.*A DREAM OF JOHN BALL, AND A KING'S LESSON.* 12mo., 1s. 6d.*NEWS FROM NOWHERE;* or, An Epoch of Rest. Being some Chapters from an Utopian Romance. Post 8vo., 1s. 6d.*THE STORY OF GRETTIR THE STRONG.*  
Translated from the Icelandic by EIRIKR MAGNÚSSON and WILLIAM MORRIS. Cr. 8vo., 5s. net.*THREE NORTHERN LOVE STORIES, AND OTHER TALES.* Translated from the Icelandic by EIRIKR MAGNÚSSON and WILLIAM MORRIS. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

\* \* For Mr. William Morris's other Works, see pp. 20, 30 and 32.

**Newman (CARDINAL).***LOSS AND GAIN:* The Story of a Convert. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*CALLISTA:* A Tale of the Third Century. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Phillipps-Wolley.**—*SNAP:* a Legend of the Lone Mountain. By C. PHILLIPPS-WOLLEY. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Raymond.**—*TWO MEN O' MENDIP.*  
By WALTER RAYMOND. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Ridley.**—*ANNE MILDENHARING.* By ALICE RIDLEY, Author of *The Story of Aline*. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Sewell (ELIZABETH M.).**

A Glimpse of the World	Amy Herbert.
Laneton Parsonage.	Cleve Hall.
Margaret Percival.	Gertrude.
Katharine Ashton.	Home Life.
The Earl's Daughter.	After Life.
The Experience of Life.	Ursula. 1vols.

Cr. 8vo., cloth plain, 1s. 6d. each. Cloth extra, gilt edges. 2s. 6d. each.

**Sheehan.**—*LUKE DIMMICK.* By the Rev. P. A. SHEEHAN, P.P., Author of 'My New Curate'. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Somerville (E. (E.) and Ross (MARTIN).***SOME EXPERIENCES OF AN IRISH R.M.* With 31 Illustrations by E. E. SOMERVILLE. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE REAL CHARLOTTE.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE SILVER FOX.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.***Stevenson (ROBERT LOUIS).**

*THE STRANGE CASE OF DR JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. sewed. 1s. 6d. cloth.

*THE STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE; WITH OTHER FABLES.* Crown 8vo., bound in buckram, with gilt top, 5s. net.  
'Silver Library' Edition. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*MORE NEW ARABIAN NIGHTS—THE DYNAMITER.* By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON and FANNY VAN DE GRIFF STEVENSON. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE WRONG BOX.* By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON and LLOYD OSBOURNE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Suttner.**—*LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS.* (*Die Waffen Nieder*): The Autobiography of Martha von Tilling. By BERTHA VON SUTTNER. Translated by T. HOLMES. Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

**Swan.**—*BALIST.* By MYRA SWAN. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Trollope (ANTHONY)**

*THE WARDEN.* Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

*BARCHESTER TOWERS.* Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

**Walford (L. B.).**

*CHARLOTTE.* Crown 8vo., 6s.

*ONE OF OURSELVES.* Cr. 8vo., 6s.

*THE INTRUDERS.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*LEDDY MARGET.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*IVA KILDARE: a Matrimonial Problem.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*MR. SMITH: a Part of his Life.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*THE BABY'S GRANDMOTHER.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*COUSINS.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*TROUBLESOME DAUGHTERS.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

**Walford (L. B.)—continued.**

*PAULINE.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*DICK NETHERBY.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*THE HISTORY OF A WEEK.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*A STIFF-NECKED GENERATION.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*NAN, and other Stories.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*THE MISCHIEF OF MONICA.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*THE ONE GOOD GUEST.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*'PLOUGHED,' and other Stories.* Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*THE MATCHMAKER.* Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

**Ward.**—*ONE POOR SCRUP.* By MRS. WILLERD WARD. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**West.**—*EDMUND FULLISTON.* OR, *The Family Evil Genius.* By B. B. WEST, Author of 'Half Hours with the Millionaires,' etc. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Weyman (STANLEY).**

*THE HOUSE OF THE WOLF.* With Frontispiece and Vignette. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*A GENTLEMAN OF FRANCE.* With Frontispiece and Vignette. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

*THE RED COCKADE.* With Frontispiece and Vignette. Crown 8vo., 6s.

*SHREWSBURY.* With 24 Illustrations by CLAUDE A. SHEPPERSON. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

*SOPHIE.* With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo., 6s.

**Yeats (S. LEFFELL)**

*THE CHEVALIER D'ARLAC.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE TRAITOR'S WIFE.* Cr. 8vo., 6s.

## Popular Science (Natural History, &amp;c.).

**Butler.**—*OUR HOUSEHOLD INSECTS.* An Account of the Insect-Pests found in Dwelling-Houses. By EDWARD A. BUTLER, B.A., B.Sc. (Lond.). With 113 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Furneaux (W.).**

*THE OUTDOOR WORLD; or The Young Collector's Handbook.* With 18 Plates (16 of which are coloured), and 549 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s. net.

**Furneaux (W.)—continued.**

*BUTTERFLIES AND MOTHS* (British). With 12 coloured Plates and 241 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s. net.

*LIFE IN PONDS AND STREAMS.* With 8 coloured Plates and 331 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s. net.

**Popular Science (Natural History, &c.)—continued.**

**Hartwig (GEORGE).**

*THE SEA AND ITS LIVING WONDERS.* With 12 Plates and 303 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7s. net.

*THE TROPICAL WORLD.* With 8 Plates and 172 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7s. net.

*THE POLAR WORLD.* With 3 Maps, 8 Plates and 85 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7s. net.

*THE SUBTERRANEAN WORLD.* With 3 Maps and 86 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7s. net.

**Helmholtz.**—*POPULAR LECTURES ON SCIENTIFIC SUBJECTS.* By HERMANN VON HELMHOLTZ. With 68 Woodcuts. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

**Hudson (W. H.).**

*BIRDS AND MAN.* Large crown 8vo., 6s. net.

*NATURE IN DOOMSLAND.* With 12 Plates and 14 Illustrations in the Text by A. D. McCORMICK. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

*BRITISH BIRDS.* With a Chapter on Structure and Classification by FRANK F. BEDDARD, F.R.S. With 16 Plates (8 of which are Coloured), and over 100 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s. net.

*BIRDS IN LONDON.* With 17 Plates and 15 Illustrations in the Text, by BRYAN HOOK, A. D. McCORMICK, and from Photographs from Nature, by R. B. LONGE. 8vo., 12s.

**Proctor (RICHARD A.).**

*LIGHT SCIENCE FOR LEISURE HOURS.* Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. Vol. I. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Proctor (RICHARD A.)—continued.**

*ROUGH WAYS MADE SMOOTH.* Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*PLEASANT WAYS IN SCIENCE.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*NATURE STUDIES.* By R. A. PROCTOR, GEORGE ALLEN, A. WILSON, T. FOSTER and E. CLODD. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*LEISURE READINGS.* By R. A. PROCTOR, E. CLODD, A. WILSON, T. FOSTER and A. C. RANYARD. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

\* For Mr. Proctor's other books see pp. 14 and 28, and Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s Catalogue of Scientific Works.

**Stanley.** *A FAMILIAR HISTORY OF BIRDS.* By E. STANLEY, D.D., formerly Bishop of Norwich. With 160 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Wood (REV. J. G.).**

*HOMES WITHOUT HANDS: A Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to the Principle of Construction.* With 140 Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 7s. net.

*INSECTS AT HOME: A Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits and Transformations.* With 700 Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 7s. net.

*OUT OF DOORS: a Selection of Original Articles on Practical Natural History.* With 11 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*STRANGE DWELLINGS: a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands'.* With 60 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*PEET AND REVISITED.* With 33 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Works of Reference.**

**Gwilt.**—*AN ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ARCHITECTURE.* By JOSEPH GWILT, F.S.A. With 1700 Engravings. Revised (1888), with Alterations and Considerable Additions by WYATT PAPWORTH. 8vo., 21s. net.

**Maunder (SAMUEL).**

\**BIOGRAPHICAL TREASURY.* With Supplement brought down to 1889. By REV. JAMES WOOD. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

*TREASURY OF GEOGRAPHY,* Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

*THE TREASURY OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE.* By the Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. With 5 Maps, 15 Plates, and 300 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

*TREASURY OF KNOWLEDGE AND LIBRARY OF REFERENCE.* Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

*HISTORICAL TREASURY.* Fcp. 8vo. 6s

**Maunder (SAMUEL)—continued.**

*THE TREASURY OF BOTANY.* Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S., and T. MOORE, F.L.S. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. 2 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 12s.

**Roget.**—*THE SAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES.* Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By PETER MARK ROGET, M.D., F.R.S. Recomposed throughout, enlarged and improved, partly from the Author's Notes, and with a full Index, by the Author's Son, JOHN LEWIS ROGET. Crown 8vo., 9s. net.

**Willich.**—*POPULAR TABLES* for giving information for ascertaining the value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, the Public Funds, etc. By CHARLES M. WILlich. Edited by H. BENCE JONES. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.



## Children's Books.

- Adelborg.**—*CLEAN PETER AND THE CHILDREN OF GRUBBYLEA.* By OTTILIA ADELBOURG. Translated from the Swedish by MRS. GRAHAM WALLAS. With 23 Coloured Plates. Oblong 4to., boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Brown.**—*THE BOOK OF SAINTS AND FRIENDLY BEASTS.* By ABBIE FARWELL BROWN. With 8 Illustrations by FANNY Y. CORY. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d. net.
- Buckland.**—*TWO LITTLE RUNAWAYS.* Adapted from the French of LOUIS DES NOVERS. By JAMES BUCKLAND. With 110 Illustrations by CECIL ALDIN. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
- Corbin and Going.**—*URCHINS OF THE SEA.* By MARIE OVERTON CORBIN and CHARLES BUXTON GOING. With Drawings by F. I. BENNETT. Oblong 4to., 3s. 6d.
- Crake (Rev. A. D.).**  
*EDWY THE FAIR;* or, The First Chronicle of Æscundune. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2s. net.  
*ALFGAR THE DANE;* or, The Second Chronicle of Æscundune. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2s. net.  
*THE RIVAL HEIRS:* being the Third and Last Chronicle of Æscundune. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2s. net.  
*THE HOUSE OF WALDERNE.* A Tale of the Cloister and the Forest in the Days of the Bârons' Wars. Crown 8vo., silver top, 2s. net.  
*BRIAN FITZ-COUNT.* A Story of Wallingford Castle and Dorchester Abbey. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2s. net.
- Henty (G. A.).**—EDITED BY.  
*YULE LOGS:* A Story-Book for Boys. By VARIOUS AUTHORS. With 61 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.  
*YULE TIDE YARNS:* a Story Book for Boys. By VARIOUS AUTHORS. With 45 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.
- Lang (ANDREW).**—EDITED BY.  
*THE VIOLET FAIRY BOOK.* With 8 Coloured Plates and 54 other Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE BLUE FAIRY BOOK.* With 138 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE RED FAIRY BOOK.* With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE GREEN FAIRY BOOK.* With 99 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE GREY FAIRY BOOK.* With 65 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.
- Lang (ANDREW).**—EDITED BY—*cont.*  
*THE YELLOW FAIRY BOOK.* With 104 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE PINK FAIRY BOOK.* With 67 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE BLUE POETRY BOOK.* With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE TRUE STORY BOOK.* With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE RED TRUE STORY BOOK.* With 100 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE ANIMAL STORY BOOK.* With 67 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE RED BOOK OF ANIMAL STORIES.* With 65 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.  
*THE ARABIAN NIGHTS ENTERTAINMENTS.* With 66 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6s.
- Meade (L. T.).**  
*DADDY'S BOY.* With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.  
*DEE AND THE DUCHES.* With 7 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.  
*THE BERESFORD PRIZE.* With 7 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.  
*THE HOUSE OF SURPRISES.* With 6 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3s. net.
- Murray.**—*FLOWER LEGENDS FOR CHILDREN.* By HILDA MURRAY (the Hon. Mrs. MURRAY of Elibank). Pictured by J. S. LEAND. With numerous Coloured and other Illustrations. Oblong 4to., 6s.
- Penrose.**—*CHUBBY:* a Nuisance. By MRS. PENROSE. With Illustrations.
- Praeger (ROSAMOND).**  
*THE ADVENTURES OF THE THREE BOLD BARS: HECTOR, HONORIA AND ALEXANDER.* A Story in Pictures. With 24 Coloured Plates and 24 Outline Pictures. Oblong 4to., 3s. 6d.  
*THE FURTHER DOINGS OF THE THREE BOLD BARS.* With 24 Coloured Pictures and 24 Outline Pictures. Oblong 4to., 3s. 6d.
- Smith.** *THE ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH:* Captain of Two Hundred and Fifty Horse, and sometime President of Virginia. Edited by E. P. ROBERTS. Crown 8vo.
- Stevenson.**—*A CHILD'S GARDEN OF VERSES.* By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. Fcp. 8vo., gilt top, 5s.
- Tappan.**—*OLD BALLADS IN PROSE.* By EVA MARCH TAPPAN. With 4 Illustrations by FANNY Y. CORY. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 4s. 6d. net.

## Children's Books—continued.

**Upton (FLORENCE K. AND BERTHA).**

*THE ADVENTURES OF TWO DUTCH DOLLS AND A 'GOLLIWOGG'.* With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.

*THE GOLLIWOGG'S BICYCLE CLUB.* With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.

*THE GOLLIWOGG AT THE SEASIDE.* With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.

**Upton (FLORENCE K. AND BERTHA)**  
—continued.

*THE GOLLIWOGG IN WAR.* With 31 Coloured Plates. Oblong 4to., 6s.

*THE GOLLIWOGG'S POLAR ADVENTURES.* With 31 Coloured Plates. Oblong 4to., 6s.

*THE GOLLIWOGG'S AUTO-GO-CART.* With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.

*THE VAGE-MEN'S REVENGE.* With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.

## The Silver Library.

CROWN 8VO. 3s. 6d. EACH VOLUME.

**Arnold's (Sir Edwin) Seas and Lands.** With 71 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Bagshot's (W.) Biographical Studies.** 3s. 6d.

**Bagshot's (W.) Economic Studies.** 3s. 6d.

**Bagshot's (W.) Literary Studies.** With Portrait. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

**Baker's (Sir S. W.) Eight Years in Ceylon.** With 6 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Baker's (Sir S. W.) Rifle and Hound in Ceylon.** With 6 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Baring-Gould's (Rev. S.) Curious Myths of the Middle Ages.** 3s. 6d.

**Baring-Gould's (Rev. S.) Origin and Development of Religious Belief.** 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

**Becker's (W. A.) Gallus:** or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. With 26 Illus. 3s. 6d.

**Becker's (W. A.) Charicles:** or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. With 26 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Bent's (J. T.) The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland.** With 117 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Brassey's (Lady) A Voyage in the 'Sunbeam'.** With 66 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Churchill's (W. Spencer) The Story of the Malakand Field Force, 1897.** With 6 Maps and Plans. 3s. 6d.

**Clodd's (E.) Story of Creation:** a Plain Account of Evolution. With 77 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Gonybeare (Rev. W. J.) and Howson's (Very Rev. J. S.) Life and Epistles of St. Paul.** With 46 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Dougall's (L.) Beggars All:** a Novel. 3s. 6d.

**Doyle's (A. Conan) Micah Clarke.** A Tale of Monmouth's Rebellion. With 10 Illus. 3s. 6d.

**Doyle's (A. Conan) The Captain of the Polestar,** and other Tales. 3s. 6d.

**Doyle's (A. Conan) The Refugees:** A Tale of the Huguenots. With 25 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Doyle's (A. Conan) The Stark Munro Letters.** 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) The History of England,** from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. 12 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

**Froude's (J. A.) The English in Ireland.** 3 vols. 10s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon.** 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) The Spanish Story of the Armada,** and other Essays. 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century.** 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) Short Studies on Great Subjects.** 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

**Froude's (J. A.) Oceana, or England and Her Colonies.** With 9 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) The Council of Trent.** 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) The Life and Letters of Erasmus.** 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) Thomas Carlyle:** a History of his Life 1795-1835. 2 vols. 7s. 1834-1881. 2 vols. 7s.

**Froude's (J. A.) Cæsar:** a Sketch. 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) The Two Chiefs of Dunboy:** an Irish Romance of the Last Century. 3s. 6d.

**Froude's (J. A.) Writings, Selections from.** 3s. 6d.

**Gleig's (Rev. G. R.) Life of the Duke of Wellington.** With Portrait. 3s. 6d.

**Greville's (C. C. F.) Journal of the Reigns of King George IV., King William IV., and Queen Victoria.** 8 vols., 3s. 6d. each.

**Haggard's (H. R.) She:** A History of Adventure. With 32 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**Haggard's (H. R.) Allan Quatermain.** With 20 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

## The Silver Library—continued.

- Haggard's (H. R.) Colonel Quaritch, V.C.** A Tale of Country Life With Frontispiece and Vignette. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Cleopatra.** With 29 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Eric Brighteyes.** With 59 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Beatrice.** With Frontispiece and Vignette. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Allan's Wife.** With 34 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard (H. R.) Heart of the World.** With 15 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Montezuma's Daughter.** With 25 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Swallow: a Tale of the Great Trek.** With 8 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) The Witch's Head.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. P.) Mr. Meeson's Will.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Nada the Lily.** With 23 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Dawn.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) The People of the Mist.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Joan Haste.** With 20 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard (H. R.) and Lang's (A.) The World's Desire.** With 27 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Harte's (Bret) In the Carquinez Woods and other Stories.** 3s. 6d.
- Helmholtz's (Hermann von) Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects.** With 58 Illustrations. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Hope's (Anthony) The Heart of Princess Osra.** With 9 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Howitt's (W.) Visits to Remarkable Places.** With 80 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) The Story of My Heart: My Autobiography.** With Portrait. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) Field and Hedgerow.** With Portrait. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) Red Deer.** With 17 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) Wood Magic: a Fable.** With Frontispiece and Vignette by E. V. B. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies (R.) The Tollers of the Field.** With Portrait from the Bust in Salisbury Cathedral. 3s. 6d.
- Kaye (Sir J.) and Mollison's (Colonel) History of the Indian Mutiny of 1857-8.** 6 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Knight's (E. F.) The Cruise of the 'Alerte': the Narrative of a Search for Treasure on the Desert Island of Trinidad.** With 2 Maps and 23 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Knight's (E. F.) Where Three Empires Meet: a Narrative of Recent Travel in Kashmir, Western Tibet, Balistan, Gilgit.** With a Map and 54 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Knight's (E. F.) The 'Falcon' on the Baltic: a Coasting Voyage from Hammersmith to Copenhagen in a Three-Ton Yacht.** With Map and 11 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Kostlin's (J.) Life of Luther.** With 62 Illustrations and 4 Facsimiles of MSS. 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) Angling Sketches.** With 20 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) Custom and Myth: Studies of Early Usage and Belief.** 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) Cock Lane and Common-Sense.** 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) The Book of Dreams and Ghosts.** 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) A Monk of Fife: a Story of the Days of Joan of Arc.** With 13 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) Myth, Ritual, and Religion.** 2 vols. 7s.
- Lees (J. A.) and Clutterbuck's (W. J.) B. C. 1887, A Ramble in British Columbia.** With Maps and 75 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Levett-Veats' (S.) The Chevalier D'Aurillac.** 3s. 6d.
- Macaulay's (Lord) Complete Works.** 'Albany' Edition With 12 Portraits. 12 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Macaulay's (Lord) Essays and Lays of Ancient Rome, etc.** With Portrait and 4 Illustrations to the 'Lays'. 3s. 6d.
- Macleod's (H. D.) Elements of Banking.** 3s. 6d.
- Marshmar's (J. C.) Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock.** 3s. 6d.
- Mason (A. E. W.) and Lang's (A.) Parson Kelly.** 3s. 6d.
- Merivale's (Dean) History of the Romans under the Empire.** 8 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Merriman's (H. S.) Flotsam: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny.** 3s. 6d.
- Mill's (J. S.) Political Economy.** 3s. 6d.
- Mill's (J. S.) System of Logic.** 3s. 6d.
- Milner's (Geo.) Country Pleasures: the Chronicle of a Year chiefly in a garden.** 3s. 6d.
- Nansen's (F.) The First Crossing of Greenland.** With 142 Illustrations and 2 Maps. 3s. 6d.
- Phillipps-Wolley's (C.) Snap: a Legend of the Lone Mountain.** With 13 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) The Orbs Around Us.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) The Expanse of Heaven.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Light Science for Leisure Hours.** First Series. 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) The Moon.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Other Worlds than Ours.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Our Place among Infinities: a Series of Essays contrasting our Little Abode in Space and Time with the Infinities around us.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Other Suns than Ours.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Rough Ways made Smooth.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Pleasant Ways in Science.** 3s. 6d.
- Proctor's (R. A.) Myths and Marvels of Astronomy.** 3s. 6d.

The Silver Library—*continued.*

- Proctor's (R. A.) Nature Studies.** 3s. 6d.  
**Proctor's (R. A.) Leisure Readings.** By R. A. PROCTOR, EDWARD CLODD, ANDREW WILSON, THOMAS FOSTER, and A. C. RANYARD. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d.  
**Rossetti's (Maria F.) A Shadow of Dante.** 3s. 6d.  
**Smith's (R. Bosworth) Carthage and the Carthaginians.** With Maps, Plans, etc. 3s. 6d.  
**Stanley's (Bishop) Familiar History of Birds.** With 160 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.  
**Stephen's (L.) The Playground of Europe (The Alps).** With 4 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.  
**Stevenson's (R. L.) The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde;** with other Fables. 3s. 6d.  
**Stevenson (R. L.) and Osbourne's (Ll.) The Wrong Box.** 3s. 6d.  
**Stevenson (Robert Louis) and Stevenson's (Fanny van de Grift) More New Arabian Nights.**—The Dynamiter. 3s. 6d.  
**Trevelyan's (Sir G. O.) The Early History of Charles James Fox.** 3s. 6d.  
**Weyman's (Stanley J.) The House of the Wolf:** a Romance. 3s. 6d.  
**Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Petland Revisited.** With 33 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.  
**Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Strange Dwellings.** With 60 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.  
**Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Out of Doors.** With 11 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

## Cookery, Domestic Management, &amp;c.

- Acton.**—*MODERN COOKERY.* By ELIZA ACTON. With 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 4s. 6d.  
**Angwin.**—*SIMPLE HINTS ON CHOICE OF FOOD,* with Tested and Economical Recipes. For Schools, Homes, and Classes for Technical Instruction. By M. C. ANGWIN, Diplomat (First Class) of the National Union for the Technical Training of Women, etc. Crown 8vo., 1s.  
**Ashby.**—*HEALTH IN THE NURSERY.* By HENRY ASHBY, M.D., F.R.C.P., Physician to the Manchester Children's Hospital. With 25 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. net.  
**Bull (THOMAS, M.D.).**  
*HINTS TO MOTHERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF THEIR HEALTH DURING THE PERIOD OF PREGNANCY.* Fcp. 8vo., sewed, 1s. 6d.; cloth, gilt edges, 2s. net.  
*THE MATERNAL MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN IN HEALTH AND DISEASE.* Fcp. 8vo., sewed, 1s. 6d.; cloth, gilt edges, 2s. net.  
**De Salis (Mrs.).**  
*LA MODE COOKERY.* Up-to-date Recipes. With 24 Plates (16 in Colour). Crown 8vo.  
*CAKES AND CONFECTIONS À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*DOGS: A Manual for Amateurs.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*DRESSED GAME AND POULTRY À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*DRESSED VEGETABLES À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*DRINKS À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*ENTRÉES À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
**De Salis (Mrs.).—continued.**  
*FLORAL DECORATIONS.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*GARDENING À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo. Part I., Vegetables, 1s. 6d. Part II., Fruits, 1s. 6d.  
*NATIONAL VIANDS À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*NEW-LAID EGGS.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*OYSTERS À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*PUDDINGS AND PASTRY À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*SAVOIRES À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*SOUPS AND DRESSED FISH À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*SHEETS AND SUPPER DISHES À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*TEMPTING DISHES FOR SMALL INCOMES.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
*WRINKLES AND NOTIONS FOR EVERY HOUSEHOLD.* Crown 8vo., 1s. 6d.  
**Lear.**—*MAIGRE COOKERY.* By H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. 16mo., 2s.  
**Poole.**—*COOKERY FOR THE DIABETIC.* By W. H. and Mrs. POOLE. With Preface by Dr. PAVY. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.  
**Rotheram.**—*HOUSEHOLD COOKERY RECIPES.* By M. A. ROTHERAM, First Class Diplômée, National Training School of Cookery, London; Instructor to the Bedfordshire County Council. Crown 8vo., 2s.

## The Fine Arts and Music.

- Burns and Colenso.**—*LIVING ANATOMY*. By CECIL L. BURNS, R.B.A., and ROBERT J. COLENZO, M.A., M.D. 40 Plates, 11½ by 8½ ins., each Plate containing Two Figures—(a) A Natural Male or Female Figure; (b) The same Figure Anatomised. In a Portfolio, 7s. 6d. net.
- Hamlin.**—*A TEXT-BOOK OF THE HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE*. By A. D. F. HAMLIN, A.M. With 229 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Haweis** (REV. H. R.).  
*MUSIC AND MORALS*. With Portrait of the Author, and numerous Illustrations, Facsimiles, and Diagrams. Cr. 8vo., 6s. net.  
*MY MUSICAL LIFE*. With Portrait of Richard Wagner and 3 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.
- Huish, Head, and Longman.**—*SAMPLERS AND TAPESTRY EMBROIDERIES*. By MARCUS B. HUISH, LL.B.; also 'The Stitchery of the Same,' by MRS. HEAD, and 'Foreign Samplers,' by MRS. C. J. LONGMAN. With 30 Reproductions in Colour, and 40 Illustrations in Monochrome. 4to, £2 2s. net.
- Hullah.**—*THE HISTORY OF MODERN MUSIC*. By JOHN HULLAH. 8vo., 8s. 6d.
- Jameson** (MRS. ANNA).  
*SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART*, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, St. Mary Magdalene, the Patron Saints, the Martyrs, the Early Bishops, the Hermits, and the Warrior-Saints of Christendom, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo., 20s. net.  
*LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS*, as represented in the Fine Arts, comprising the Benedictines and Augustines, and Orders derived from their Rules, the Mendicant Orders, the Jesuits, and the Order of the Visitation of St. Mary. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo., 10s. net.  
*LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY*. Devotional with and without the Infant Jesus, Historical from the Annunciation to the Assumption, as represented in Sacred and Legendary Christian Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo., 10s. net.  
*THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD*, as exemplified in Works of Art, with that of His Types, St. John the Baptist, and other persons of the Old and New Testament. Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON; continued and completed by LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo., 20s. net.
- Kingsley.**—*A HISTORY OF FRENCH ART, 1100-1899*. By ROSE G. KINGSLEY. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.
- Kristeller.**—*ANDREA MANTEGNA*. By PAUL KRISTELLER. English Edition by S. ARTHUR STRONG, M.A., Librarian to the House of Lords, and at Chatsworth. With 26 Photogravure Plates and 162 Illustrations in the Text. 4to., gilt top, £3 10s. net.
- Macfarren.**—*LECTURES ON HARMONY*. By SIR GEORGE A. MACFARREN. 8vo., 12s.
- Morris** (WILLIAM).  
*HOPES AND FEARS FOR ART*. Five Lectures delivered in Birmingham, London, etc., in 1878-1881. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.  
*AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES TO STUDENTS OF THE BIRMINGHAM MUNICIPAL SCHOOL OF ART ON 21ST FEBRUARY, 1894*. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (Printed in 'Golden' Type.)  
*ART AND THE BEAUTY OF THE EARTH*: a Lecture delivered at Burslem Town Hall, on October 13, 1881. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (Printed in 'Golden' Type.)  
*SOME HINTS ON PATTERN-DESIGNING*: a Lecture delivered at the Working Men's College, London, on 10th December, 1881. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (Printed in 'Golden' Type.)  
*ARTS AND ITS PRODUCTIONS* (1888) AND *THE ARTS AND CRAFTS OF TO-DAY* (1889). 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (Printed in 'Golden' Type.)  
*ARCHITECTURE AND HISTORY, AND WESTMINSTER ABBEY*. Two Papers read before the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (Printed in 'Golden' Type.)  
*ARTS AND CRAFTS ESSAYS*. By Members of the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society. With a Preface by WILLIAM MORRIS. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.  
 \* \* For Mr. William Morris's other Works, see pp. 20, 23 and 32. \*
- Van Dyke.**—*A TEXT-BOOK ON THE HISTORY OF PAINTING*. By JOHN C. VAN DYKE. With 110 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
- Willard.**—*HISTORY OF MODERN ITALIAN ART*. By ASHTON ROLLINS WILLARD. With Photogravure Frontispiece and 28 Full-page Illustrations. 8vo., 18s. net.
- Wellington.**—*A DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL CATALOGUE OF THE COLLECTIONS OF PICTURES AND SCULPTURE AT APSLEY HOUSE, LONDON*. By EVELYN, Duchess of Wellington. Illustrated by 52 Photo-Engravings, specially executed by BRAUN, CLÉMENT, & Co., of Paris. 2 vols., royal 4to., £6 6s. net.

## Miscellaneous and Critical Works.

- Annals of Mathematics** (under the Auspices of Harvard University). Issued Quarterly. 4to., 2s. net each number.
- Bagehot.**—*LITERARY STUDIES.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. With Portrait. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.
- Baker.**—*EDUCATION AND LIFE:* Papers and Addresses. By JAMES H. BAKER, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.
- Baring-Gould.**—*CURIOUS MYTHS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.* By Rev. S. BARING-GOULD. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Baynes.**—*SHAKESPEARE STUDIES,* and other Essays. By the late THOMAS SPENCER BAYNES, LL.B., LL.D. With a Biographical Preface by Professor LEWIS CAMPBELL. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Charities Register, The Annual,** AND DIGEST: being a Classified Register of Charities in or available in the Metropolis. With an Introduction by C. S. LOCK, Secretary to the Council of the Charity Organisation Society, London. 8vo., 4s.
- Christie.**—*SELECTED ESSAYS.* By RICHARD COPLEY CHRISTIE, M.A., Oxon. Hon. LL.D., Vict. Edited with a Memoir by W. A. SHAW, LL.D. With 2 Portraits and 3 other Illustrations. 8vo., 12s. net.
- Dickinson.**—*KING ARTHUR IN CORNWALL.* By W. HOWSHIP DICKINSON, M.D. With 5 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.
- Essays in Paradox.** By the Author of 'Exploded Ideas' and 'Times and Days'. Crown 8vo., 5s.
- Evans.**—*THE ANCIENT STONE IMPLEMENTS, WEAPONS AND ORNAMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.* By Sir JOHN EVANS, K.C.B. With 537 Illustrations. 8vo., 28s.
- Exploded Ideas, AND OTHER ESSAYS.** By the Author of 'Times and Days'. Cr. 8vo., 5s.
- Frost.**—*A MEDICAL BOOK.* By GEORGE FROST, Author of 'Where is your Husband, and other Brown Studies'. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.
- Geikie.**—*THE FRANKLIN FRIENDS.* Reported by CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., LL.D., late Vicar of St. Mary's, Barnstaple. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.
- Haggard.**—*A FARMER'S YEAR:* being his Commonplace Book for 1898. By H. RIDER HAGGARD. With 36 Illustrations by G. LEON LITTLE and 3 others. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d. net.
- Hodgson.**—*OUTCAST ESSAYS AND VERSE TRANSLATIONS.* By SHADWORTH H. HODGSON, LL.D. Crown 8vo., 8s. 6d.
- Hoenig.**—*INQUIRIES CONCERNING THE TACTICS OF THE FUTURE.* By FRITZ HOENIG. With 1 Sketch in the Text and 5 Maps. Translated by Captain H. M. BOWER. 8vo., 15s. net.
- Hutchinson.**—*DREAMS AND THEIR MEANINGS.* By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON. With many Accounts of Experiences sent by Correspondents, and Two Chapters contributed mainly from the Journals of the Psychical Research Society on Telepathic and Premonitory Dreams. 8vo., gilt top, 9s. 6d. net.
- Jefferies (RICHARD).**  
*FIELD AND HEDGEWATER:* With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*THE STORY OF MY HEART:* my Autobiography. With Portrait and New Preface by C. J. LONGMAN. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*RED DEER.* With 17 Illustrations by J. CHARLTON and H. TUNLEY. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*THE TOILETS OF THE FIELD.* With Portrait from the Bust in Salisbury Cathedral. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.  
*WOOD MAGN:* a Fable. With Frontispiece and Vignette by E. V. B. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Jekyll (GERTRUDE).**  
*HOME AND GARDEN:* Notes and Thoughts, Practical and Critical, of a Worker in both. With 53 Illustrations from Photographs. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.  
*WOOD AND GARDEN:* Notes and Thoughts, Practical and Critical, of a Working Amateur. With 71 Photographs. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.
- Johnson (J. & J. H.).**  
*THE PATENTEE'S MANUAL:* a Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent. 8vo., 10s. 6d.  
*AN EPITOME OF THE LAW AND PRACTICE CONNECTED WITH PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS,* with a reprint of the Patents Acts of 1883, 1885, 1886 and 1888. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.
- Joyce.**—*THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF IRISH NAMES OF PLACES.* By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 5s. each.

## Miscellaneous and Critical Works—continued.

**Lang (ANDREW).**

*LETTERS TO DEAD AUTHORS.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*BOOKS AND BOOKMEN.* With 2 Coloured Plates and 17 Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*OLD FRIENDS.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*LETTERS ON LITERATURE.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*ESSAYS IN LITTLE.* With Portrait of the Author. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

*COCK LANE AND COMMON-SENSE.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

*THE BOOK OF DREAMS AND GHOSTS.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Maryon.**—*HOW THE GARDEN GREW.*

By MAUD MARYON. With 4 Illustrations by GORDON BOWNT. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

**Matthews.**—*NOTES ON SPEECH-MAKING.* By BRANDER MATTHEWS. Fcp.

8vo., 1s. 6d. net.

**Max Müller (The Right Hon. F.).**

*CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP.*

Vol. I. Recent Essays and Addresses. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Vol. II. Biographical Essays. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Vol. III. Essays on Language and Literature. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Vol. IV. Essays on Mythology and Folk Lore. Crown 8vo., 5s.

*INDIA: WHAT CAN IT TEACH US?* Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Milner.**—*COUNTRY PLEASURES:* the

Chronicle of a Year chiefly in a Garden. By GEORGE MILNER. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Morris.**—*SIGNS OF CHANGE.* Seven

Lectures delivered on various Occasions. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Post 8vo., 4s. 6d.

**Parker and Unwin.**—*THE ART OF BUILDING A HOME:* a Collection of

Lectures and Illustrations. By BARRY PARKER and RAYMOND UNWIN. With 68 Full-page Plates. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

**Passmore.**—*LEISURABLE STUDIES.*

By the Rev. T. H. PASSMORE, M.A. Cr. 8vo., 4s. net.

CONTENTS: The 'Religious Woman'—Preachments—Silly Ritual—The Tyranny of the Word—The Lectern—The Functions of Ceremonial—Homo Creator—Concerning the Pun—Proverbia.

10,000/2/02

**Pollock.**—*JANE AUSTEN:* her Contemporaries and Herself. By WALTER HERRIES POLLOCK. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.

**Poore (GEORGE VIVIAN, M.D.).**

*ESSAYS ON RURAL HYGIENE.* With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.

*THE DWELLING-HOUSE.* With 36 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Rossetti.**

*DANTE:* being an Essay towards studying Himself, his World and his Pilgrimage. By MARIA FRANCESCA ROSSETTI. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

**Soulsby (LUCY H. M.).**

*STRAY THOUGHTS ON READING.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*STRAY THOUGHTS FOR GIRLS.* 16mo., 1s. 6d. net.

*STRAY THOUGHTS FOR MOTHERS AND TEACHERS.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*STRAY THOUGHTS FOR INVALIDS.* 16mo., 2s. net.

*STRAY THOUGHTS ON CHARACTER.* Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

**Southey.**—*THE CORRESPONDENCE OF ROBERT SOUTHHEY WITH CAROLINE BOWLES.*

Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN. 8vo., 14s.

**Stevens.**—*ON THE STOWAGE OF SHIPS AND THEIR CARGOS.* With Information regarding Freights, Charter-Parties, etc. By

ROBERT WHITE STEVENS. 8vo., 21s.

**Sutherland.**—*TWENTIETH CENTURY INTENTIONS:* a Forecast. By GEORGE

SUTHERLAND, M.A. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d. net.

**Turner and Sutherland.**—*THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUSTRALIAN LITERATURE.*

By HENRY GYLES TURNER and ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND. With Portraits and Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

**Warwick.**—*PROGRESS IN WOMEN'S EDUCATION IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE:* being

the Report of Conferences and a Congress held in connection with the Educational Section, Victorian Era Exhibition. Edited by the COUNTESS OF WARWICK. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

**Weathers.**—*A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO GARDEN PLANTS.* By JOHN WEATHERS,

F.R.H.S. With 159 Diagrams. 8vo., 21s. net.

**Whittall.**—*FREDERICK THE GREAT ON KINGCRAFT,* from the Original Manuscript; with Reminiscences and Turkish

Stories. By Sir J. WILLIAM WHITTALL, President of the British Chamber of Commerce of Turkey. 8vo., 7s. 6d. net.



















